



S. EDMUND'S COLLEGE.



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES



142 21/-
XLI F9



THE
VISIBLE UNITY
OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH.

VOL. I.

Ecclesie autem unitas in duobus attenditur: scilicet in connexione membrorum Ecclesie ad invicem, seu communicatione; et iterum in ordine omnium membrorum Ecclesie ad unum caput, secundum illud ad Coloss. ii. 18, 19: *Inflatus sensu carnis sur, et non tenens Caput, ex quo totum corpus, per nexus et conjunctiones subministratum et constructum, crescit in augmentum Dei.* Hoc autem caput est ipse Christus, cujus vicem in Ecclesia gerit Summus Pontifex. Et ideo schismatici dicuntur qui subesse renuunt Summo Pontifici, et qui membris Ecclesie ei subjectis communicare recusant.

S. THOM. AQUIN. *Summ. Theol. 2da 2de. Quest. xxxix. Art. i. n. 3.*

THE
Rev. M. Barry
VISIBLE UNITY

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

MAINTAINED AGAINST OPPOSITE THEORIES :

WITH AN

EXPLANATION OF CERTAIN PASSAGES IN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
ERRONEOUSLY APPEALED TO IN THEIR SUPPORT.

BY

M. J. RHODES, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON :
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1870.

EX
1783
R 346
v. 1

DEDICATORY LETTER, &c.



*To the Right Reverend WM. DELANY, D.D.,
Lord Bishop of Cork.*

MY DEAR LORD,

In addition to the daily spiritual benefits conferred upon your own numerous flock by your Lordship's unwearied pastoral exertions, many a stranger's heart is cheered and gladdened by the hospitable welcome which your truly Christian kindness so largely extends to all.

Englishmen especially may thereby be reminded of the generous and cordial greeting with which Ireland in ancient days received her many visitants from the Anglo-Saxon and the British nations, who thronged as students to her far-famed halls of learning, or sought the way to heaven, as disciples of Christ, in her equally celebrated schools of piety and high religion.

The motives which led to my long sojourn in your Lordship's diocese were more ordinary in their nature, and did not entitle me to any such reception. Yet during the seven or eight years through which it has been my privilege to love and venerate you as my Bishop, the repeated marks of favour which your unceasing goodness

has heaped upon me, and which will ever be remembered by me with sincerest gratitude, would furnish proof, if such were needed, that the hearts of Irish Churchmen are still animated by the princely spirit of the olden time.

Now that I am returning to my native shores, your Lordship has crowned these many acts of kindness by graciously permitting me to connect your name with the present volumes.

The work was begun with your Lordship's blessing; it has progressed under your encouragement; and on its completion I thankfully avail myself of your most kind consent to allow me to dedicate it to you, as a small but earnest token of my grateful affection and my unfeigned respect.

Once more begging your episcopal benediction on the produce of my labours and on myself,

I have the honour to remain,

My dear Lord,

Your Lordship's most faithful and obliged servant,

M. J. RHODES.

GLENGARIFF, BANTRY, CO. CORK :

Feast of St. Edward the Confessor,

Oct. 13th, 1869.

To M. J. RHODES, Esq.

MY DEAR MR. RHODES,

A treatise of such graceful and scholarlike execution, on a subject so important as that which is dealt with in your work, ought to have been ushered into the world under the auspices of some more distinguished name than the obscure one you have selected. Such you might readily have found, but the extremely kind manner in which you expressed your desire to inscribe my own at the head of your book, precluded me from pressing this upon you.

In the spirit of that generous friendship which I have had the happiness of enjoying for several years, you discarded prudential considerations, and I acquiesced, under the conviction that a production of such rare and intrinsic merits must ensure its own success without any considerable delay.

A more appropriate votive tribute could not have been devised on your part, in gratitude to the blessed Spirit of light and love Who in days gone by conducted you into the communion of the Church, opening your heart to her voice and teachings, which are as ancient as Christianity and as unchanging as its truth. Your familiarity with the difficulties and misapprehensions that affect the minds of English churchmen, and the clearness with which you explain the Church's doctrine, will render your work of invaluable service in their regard; and I cannot refrain from expressing my unfeigned delight at the charitable spirit you have displayed, in your mode of treating the points of controversy which unhappily keep them apart from us.

On the other hand, Catholics, especially of these isles, must derive peculiar pleasure and no small addition to their information, from the perusal of your learned production. The Celtic tribes of these regions are only beginning to be introduced to the general acquaintance of the scholars of our day, and the pursuit of your subject has led you to the consideration of events in their history, which are of peculiar interest to ourselves, and but little known or understood. I cannot conceive how anyone can rise from the perusal of your interesting and masterly examination into the evidence which still survives upon the subject, without a thorough conviction that, notwithstanding their divergence in certain points of discipline, the ancient Christian inhabitants of these countries were bound in an indissoluble bond of union with the Mother and Mistress of Churches.

Praying a blessing on yourself and all that are dear to you, and on this work, the fruit of pious zeal,

I am,

My dear Mr. Rhodes,

Yours very sincerely,

✠ WILLIAM DELANY.

CORK: *October 22, 1869.*

PREFACE.

THIS work was originally commenced as a letter to a valued friend of early years, who took a leading part in the general meeting of the 'English Church Union,' held in July 1866; by which meeting a formal resolution was adopted, welcoming the publication of Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon,' and expressing the earnest desire of the Association for the restoration of unity to Christendom.

The proportions which the writing assumed as it progressed were larger than had been contemplated at its commencement; and when half of it was completed, my friend himself having become convinced of the divine authority of the Roman Catholic Church, sought and received admission into her communion.

A great part of the book was consequently, to some extent, recast, though not substantially altered. If there still appear in it any traces of the epistolary style, it is owing to the above-mentioned circumstance.

There may be critics, otherwise favourable, who at first sight will object to the fact of a layman having ventured to treat publicly of the matters of theology discussed in this work, particularly in the first and second sections. This difficulty presented itself to my own mind, but it was removed by the approbation with which my proposed design was received, when I submitted it to high ecclesiastical authority; and particularly by the blessing which was accorded to it from its very commencement, and the kind encouragement which throughout accompanied its prosecution, on the part of the Bishop of the diocese in which I was residing at the time. The same Right Reverend Prelate has graciously permitted me to place my volumes, now completed, under his patronage, as may be seen from the foregoing letters.

Moreover, since its completion, the whole of the work has undergone the careful examination of an ecclesiastical censor, appointed for the purpose by the Archbishop in whose diocese it is now about to be published, and whose *Imprimatur* is affixed to it. The first two sections, which form the portion of the book most directly theological, have been in type for more than two years, with the exception of changes not affecting the substance of the matter. They have been carefully perused and examined by more than one distinguished theologian

of our own isles; and, in the summer of 1867, on the occasion of the centenary of St. Peter and St. Paul, I took the opportunity of personally submitting them to the judgment of two professors of theology, belonging respectively to two of the highest ecclesiastical colleges in Rome. One of these was the Reverend Father Cardella, then of the Roman College, now Rector of the *Civiltà Cattolica*; and he has kindly permitted me to make this use of his name.

I am desirous to call particular attention to these authorities in reference to the explanation of the Church's doctrine on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, which is contained in the second section of this work. It is a point on which Dr. Pusey has more than once asked for information, and the statements which I have made respecting it have undergone the strictest scrutiny.

In order to examine and to test the truth of the theory against which these volumes are principally directed, it was necessary, in the first place, to state it with fairness and precision. This alone was the motive which induced me to adopt as my text upon the subject the extracts which I have given from the pages of Dr. Forbes. The statement which they contain of the theory in question

appears to me more clear, concise, and definite, and, I may add, at the same time more plausible, than any which I have met with elsewhere.

In addition to the extracts from Dr. Forbes, Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon' necessarily occupies a prominent position in my pages. But it has by no means been my intention to confine my observations solely to these authors. I have referred to them simply as fair and competent exponents of the theory of invisible unity.

No doubt there may be details respecting which others who maintain the same theory will be found to vary in opinion from the authors above referred to; and there may be Anglicans who would not consent to extend its application so widely as, in some respects, appears to be done by Dr. Forbes. But the theory in itself forms a largely accepted basis for common action, and a widely received rule for individual guidance; and it is to the theory itself, rather than to questions arising out of it, that I have directed my attention in these volumes. Thus, though a recent publication by Mr. Cobb,¹ was issued too late for any special notice in my pages—excepting the few remarks which will be found in a foot-note at page 329, vol. ii.—yet the

¹ 'Separation' not 'Schism.' A plea for the position of Anglican Reunionists. By Gerard Francis Cobb, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Palmer, 1869.

whole of the present work is expressly devoted to the examination of the principle upon which his opinions are based. The same remark will apply to the opinions of all writers, whether of earlier or more recent date, who adopt the same theory of the present suspension of the Church's outward unity.

It was not until after the completion of the account of the British Church, which is comprised in my second volume, that I became aware of the collection of documents lately edited by Mr. Haddan.¹ I should otherwise have derived from them considerable assistance. Although the learned editor does not hesitate to speak of the 'Schism between the British and the Roman Churches,' and to designate it as 'formal,' (p. 152), yet the facts which he has produced in his work corroborate my own statements. The very few passages amongst his quotations which may at first sight assume a different aspect, are not of sufficient weight to withstand the existing amount of counter testimony. They will bear, and they require, the same interpretation, which, as I have shown, must

¹ Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Edited after Spelman and Wilkins. By Arthur West Haddan, B.D., and William Stubbs, M.A. Vol. I. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1869.

be applied to certain strong expressions occasionally met with in the pages of St. Bede.

It has been my anxious desire, throughout the whole of this work, to avoid any term or mode of expression which might give offence. But since terms involve principles, and principles do not admit of compromise, I have at times felt some difficulty in the selection of my language. It appeared to me, however, that the simplest course was to adopt the expressions now most in use, intending them in their commonly received sense.

I have endeavoured to render the book as generally interesting and as little controversial as possible; and I have not hesitated to speak more fully than was absolutely necessary for the sake of argument, on such incidental points as appeared particularly to invite notice.

M. J. RHODES.

18 GREEN STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE,
LONDON, W.

Christmas Day, 1869.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.



INTRODUCTORY.

	PAGE
Statement of the subject of the work	1
Division of the subject	4

SECTION I.

The one true Church of Christ.

The Divine nature and origin of the Unity of Christ's Church	7
The Unity of the Church is permanently visible	8
Permanent and visible Unity is pledged to her by Christ	9
There can be no union with Christ excepting through the Church	15
Invincible ignorance	17
Individual responsibility	18
No corporate body of Christians can belong to the Church who are not visibly in her communion	20
There is only one Church	21
The one true Church is visible to all men	22
Christ's commission to His Church	25
It is acted upon by the Roman Catholic Church alone.	26
The four Notes of the Church	28
The Church's Unity	28
Rome and England not one Church	29
Differences amongst Roman Catholics	30
Inconsistent charges against them	32
Universality of the Church's Unity	34
The Church's Sanctity	35
The Church's Catholicity	38

	PAGE
Rome is the centre of her Catholicity	39
Title of Catholic	40
The Church's Apostolicity	41
Mission and jurisdiction	42
The Roman Primacy	43
Necessity of rightful jurisdiction	43
Necessity of Apostolic doctrine	44
St. Peter's chair and office	45
Distinction between the Episcopate, Apostolate, and Primacy	45
Christ founded the Church on St. Peter and his successors, associating St. Peter with Himself	48
Christ rules the Church through St. Peter and his successors	50
St. Peter's See is the strength of the Episcopate	53
It is Christ Who acts in all	55
St. Peter's office continues in his successors	56
The Primacy is a great grace	58
Visible and present testimony to the Apostolicity of Rome	60
Rome is the centre of the Church's Unity	63
The Church bears the image of her Lord	64

SECTION II.

*Examination of the theory of the existence of invisible unity between
outwardly divided bodies of Christians.*

The Church's notes are inseparable, and each one of them is indispensable	64
None of them can become invisible	65
The theory of the suspension of visible unity tested	66
Statement of the above-mentioned theory, as contained in a work entitled 'A short explanation of the Nicene Creed' by Dr. Forbes, the Anglican Bishop of Brechin	69
The Church is only one, though comprising hierarchies in many nations	75
Exclusiveness of the one Church	76
God's universal mercies	77
The Catholic doctrine on grace outside the Church, as stated by Dr. Newman	78
Cases of goodness in individuals	81
Personal responsibility	83

	PAGE
Goodness amongst the unbaptized	83
The lustre of the Church's Saints	85
Greek Missions	85
Fecundity of the Ancient Heresies	86
Nestorians	86
Jacobites	88
Arianism, and the Arian Goths	90
Bishop Ulphilas	91
Other heresies	92
State of the early ages	92
Dr. Newman's account of the fourth century	93
Dr. Newman's account of the fifth and sixth centuries	96
Present trials of the Church	98
The Church's golden age	99
Ancient appellation of ' Roman '	100
The tenth century of the Church	101
Rome and the Popes of that age	101
The Church's holiness is always visible	104
It was so in the tenth century—Instances	105
St. Romuald and Camaldoli	109
The Hospice of St. Bernard and its founder	109
Other instances	111
Cluny and its Abbots	113
Saints unknown to us	114
St. Peter Damian	116
Christ's presence in His Church is never lessened	116
Her visible unity never is suspended	119
Distinction between individual Christians and the Church	121
All the children of the Church are taught by God	122
All are not obedient	124
The Church exists for the salvation of mankind	124
God's promises to His Church are absolute and unconditional	126
Distinction between ordinary and extraordinary gifts	128
Christ's presence never varies as regards all that is needful for His Church	129
The peculiar force of the words of His promise to be always ' with her '	131
The prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Church of Christ	134

	PAGE
The prophecies of Isaias	135
The prophecies of Holy David	137
The Church is not exempted from affliction	139
The Church as described in the Book of Canticles	140
Prophecies of Ezechiel	141
Prophecies of Jeremias	143
The theory tested by the Gospel	147
It is shown to be inconsistent with the doctrine of the Gospel	148
Also with the Gospel precepts	150
Differences between Rome and England respecting points of faith	155
Difference respecting the ground of faith	156
Are they agreed respecting the articles of the faith ?	158
The Roman profession of faith	159
Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the Vicar of Jesus Christ	161
Difference respecting the Sacraments	161
Baptism	161
Confirmation	162
The Holy Eucharist	163
Penance	163
Extreme Unction	164
Teaching of the Council of Trent on Extreme Unction	164
Its object	168
Its matter	171
Its form	172
Postponement of the last Sacraments	176
Popular errors as to the time of receiving Extreme Unction	177
The Church's doctrine respecting its repetition	179
Explanation respecting its remission of sins	181
Explanation of the term 'remains of sin.'	184
The effects of Extreme Unction, as explained in the Roman Catechism	187
The teaching of St. Charles Borromeo respecting it	189
The teaching of Suarez on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction	191
It is a sacrament of special mercy	193
Difference in faith respecting it	195
Rome's maternal care for the dying	197
The Sacrament of Holy Orders	198

	PAGE
The Sacrament of Matrimony	198
Indulgences, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints	199
The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary	200
The difference between Rome and England on the above-mentioned points, proves that they are not one in the faith	203
Which of the two is right?	205
Sacraments, but not salvation, may be found outside the Catholic Church	206
As Christ acts through His ministers in baptizing, and absolving, and the rest, so through the successors of St. Peter He constantly rules His Church	208
Definition of the Unity of the Church by St. Thomas Aquinas	209
The Church requires a visible head to remove occasion of schism	210

SECTION III.

Explanation of certain passages in ecclesiastical history, appealed to in support of the theory of invisible unity.

Anglican appeal to past ecclesiastical dissensions	211
The want of analogy between the instances produced, and the present divisions of Christendom	212
The dissensions at Corinth	213
Rome appealed to, though St. John the Evangelist was still alive	213

St. Victor and the Asiatic Churches.

The grounds of the difference	215
The Synods held upon the subject	216
Letter from Polycrates and the other Asiatic bishops, to the Pope St. Victor and the Roman Church	218
The conduct of St. Victor	219
His authority not disputed	220
The result	221
Ancient testimony that there was no breach of unity	223
Decision of the Nicene Council as to the time of Easter	223

The Cyprianic contest.

Reasons for doubting whether there was any formal or complete breach of unity between St. Cyprian and the Pope St. Stephen	225
--	-----

	PAGE
Testimony of St. Augustine	226
If intercommunion was suspended, it could have been only for a passing moment	228
The special honour shown to St. Cyprian by Rome	229
The letter of Firmilian	229
It testifies to the then existing claims of the Roman See	230
Its excited language	231
The respect due to Firmilian	234
Evidence of the office of the Roman See	235
St. Vincent of Lerins extols the conduct of St. Stephen	237
The Councils of Arles and of Nice on the controverted point	239
Question of the authenticity of the letters of St. Cyprian and Firmilian	240
St. Cyprian's actual sentiments respecting the primacy of the Roman See	240

The case of St. Meletius and the divisions in Antioch.

The statements of Dr. Pusey and Dr. Forbes	243
Observations on the ecclesiastical position of Meletius	244
Position of both the Catholic parties in Antioch	246
Contrast between their position and that of the Church of England	247
Both these parties in Antioch agreed as to the faith	248
The sermon of St. Gregory Nazianzen	249
The origin of the schism in Antioch	251
The election of Meletius to the bishopric of Antioch	252
His early life and connection with the Arians	253
His election to the see of Antioch was the work of the Arian faction	255
Certain Catholics concurred in his election	256
Theodoret's account of the transaction	257
The more consistent Catholics of Antioch, viz., the 'Eusta- thians,' would not recognise his election	259
Laxity of the other Catholics of Antioch in mixing with the Arian congregations	259
Paulinus was the leader of the Eustathians in Antioch	260
St. Athanasius supported the said Eustathians	261
Respective motives of the Catholics who joined in the elec- tion of Meletius, and of the Arians, in choosing him for the see of Antioch	262

	PAGE
The glowing contemporary descriptions of 'the Great Meletius'	263
The entrance of Meletius into Antioch	265
His public profession of the Nicene Faith	267
His consequent banishment	268
The accusations against him	269
The observations of St. Epiphanius on his sermon, and on the steadfastness of his flock in the true faith	269
The rumours against St. Meletius	270
They were disregarded by St. Epiphanius.	271
The favourable change effected in Antioch by St. Meletius	272
The Eustathians still held aloof from him, though of one mind in the faith	273
St. Meletius and other Catholic bishops recalled from exile	274
Eusebius of Vercelli and Lucifer of Cagliari, who were recalled amongst the number, appear to have possessed legatine authority from the Pope, for the Council of Alexandria and the affairs of the East	275
Historical testimony to the same	279
Lucifer goes to Antioch and Eusebius to Alexandria, where, together with St. Athanasius, he convenes a Council	281
The Council of Alexandria and its indulgence to the fallen	282
The said indulgence would apply to Meletius, and was considered to do so according to the tradition of the Roman Church	284
The epistle of the Council of Alexandria respecting the affairs of Antioch	285
Remarks upon the aforesaid epistle	291
The consecration of Paulinus by Lucifer	292
The consequent displeasure of St. Eusebius of Vercelli, when he afterwards arrived in Antioch	294
The question of Lucifer's sanctity Note to p.	295
The position of Paulinus	296
The position of Meletius	298
Eusebius proceeds on his mission through the East, and then gladdens Italy by his return	300
The three exiles of St. Meletius	301
He holds a Council in Antioch	302
Its profession of faith gave rise to rumours against his orthodoxy, and against that of St. Eusebius of Samosata	303

	PAGE
Yet it fulfilled the requirements of the Council of Alexandria	305
These two bishops accused of Arianism before Pope St. Damasus, and warmly defended by St. Basil . . .	305
Interchange of communication between St. Meletius and Rome	306
Evagrius of Antioch, on his return from the West, leads St. Basil to expect that he will join the party of Meletius, but afterwards unites himself to Paulinus—Argument deduced from this	307
Neither side was separated from the universal Church . . .	308
Paulinus defends himself by a profession of his faith . . .	308
Later accusations against Paulinus	308
St. Athanasius and St. Meletius	309
Different degrees of excommunication, or of interruption of ecclesiastical communion	310
St. Basil maintains the cause of St. Meletius in a letter to St. Epiphanius	312
Yet St. Basil remained in full communion with the West . . .	313
The object which St. Basil had in view	314
Paulinus and his party elated by letters from the West . . .	315
St. Basil's letter to Count Terence on the subject	315
He writes also to St. Meletius upon it	318
The letters to Paulinus which may be supposed to be those alluded to, and their motive	318
The elation which they caused indicates the uncertainty of the position of Paulinus	320
Vitalis of Antioch	322
The letters of St. Jerome to the Pope, St. Damasus, requesting direction in his perplexities	323
Their recognition of the necessity of communion with Rome, of the Pope's authority, and of his office as guardian of the faith	324
The miserable death of the Arian Emperor Valens	327
St. Meletius returns from his third exile	328
His reception by the people, as described by St. John Chrysostom	328
The alleged compact between Meletius and Paulinus	329
Doubts whether it was really entered into	330
Both St. Meletius and Paulinus openly acknowledged by the West	332

	PAGE
Proof of the visible communion of St. Meletius with the Roman See, before the second General Council was assembled	333
Further history of the internal schism in Antioch, after the death of St. Meletius	336
Termination of the schism	337
St. Meletius is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology .	337
The said Martyrology has been more than once carefully revised and corrected	338
Strictness as to the names admitted into it	340
That of St. Meletius is still mentioned there with honour, which is a crowning proof that he died in outward and visible communion with the Roman See	341

THE
VISIBLE UNITY
OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Quam dilecta tabernacula tua Domine virtutum: concupiscit
et deficit anima mea in atria Domini.

Beati, qui habitant in domo tua Domine.

Psal. lxxxiii.

IN the earliest days of Christianity, 'the multitude of The Church continues
believers had but one heart and one soul.' But this always one.
universal unity was of short duration. Schisms and Acts iv. 32.
heresies arose whilst Apostles were still upon the
earth; divisions began to abound amongst Chris-
tians, and have ever since abounded more and more.
Nevertheless, the true Church of Christ still holds on
her course, distinct from the separated fragments,
uncontaminated by the surrounding errors, always
visibly one from the beginning, in the strength and
the unity of God.

It is a hopeful sign for our time and country that Anglican efforts
men most distinguished for their piety, learning, and for
position in the communion of the established Church of re-union.

England, have freely and openly avowed their earnest desires for the re-union of Christendom ; and have made direct efforts and proposals, in order to ascertain a basis on which negotiations for a general reconciliation might be opened, not only with the distant East, but also with the more neighbouring Church of Rome, which till recently was regarded even by the learned and the good amongst their body, as an object of mysterious and religious dread ; a bearer of subtle and deadly poison ; and one whose very fascinations were a cause and reason for mistrust. Many of the same Anglican body now acknowledge that Church, at least as their patriarchal see, and anxiously hope for the day when they may no longer be severed from her communion.

Ps. lxxvi. 11.

‘This is the change of the right hand of the Most High !’

Rome’s response.

Rome yearns over her separated children, and sighs for their return with more than any human mother’s love ; but no true love will ever betray its trust. Rome knows that heaven has confided to her a high commission for the benefit of the whole human race, and she cannot prove unfaithful to it, or play a double part by consenting to ignore it, for the sake of any end however ardently to be desired in itself. Therefore, so long as this her divine commission is unacknowledged by those who are seeking for re-union, she can make no response to their advances, except by earnest exhortations, and unceasing prayer for them to God.

Underlying this great difficulty there is another, connected with it, but requiring special consideration. The Anglican proposals for re-union assume, as a first principle, that the present divisions of Christendom, so far at least as regards the three great communions of Rome, the East, and England, though grave, still are not vital, for that the outwardly-divided bodies continue inwardly one in Christ. The maintainers of this opinion do not deny that there is only one Church of Christ, and that outside that Church there is no salvation; but they assert that essential unity may exist without being visible, and not only (as is allowed by Rome), that individuals invincibly ignorant may belong to the soul of the Church though outwardly separated from her visible communion; but also, that the separate and independent religious bodies which have been mentioned, though visibly divided and without any outward intercommunion, nevertheless form together in the sight of God, that one holy Catholic Church which is animated by His one Spirit, and constitutes His one ambassador to fallen man, being in reality, the one Body of His Son. Rome rejects this doctrine, and asserts that the Church of Christ can suffer no division, either visible or invisible, but must continue to the eyes of all men, always and only one, outwardly as well as inwardly; that the visible intercommunion of all the parts and all the members is essential to their life, and also to the integrity of the one body; that without it

The Anglican proposals are based on a principle repudiated by Rome.

they cease to be animated by the one Spirit; and that, apart from visible communion with this one Church, no religious body can be a channel of the grace of Christ; nor any single soul attain salvation, excepting in the case of individuals whose ignorance is invincible in the sight of God.

Object of
the
present work.

This is the point on which both parties finally join issue. It lies at the root of the whole question, and it is not easy to perceive how any further advance can be made towards reconciliation until this difficulty is removed. Therefore, all those who truly desire the re-union of a divided Christendom (and what Christian heart does not yearn to see it?) are interested in the examination of the Anglican theory which maintains that the one Church of Christ is now outwardly split into fragments which have no visible intercommunion, but which, in spite of their external division, are nevertheless internally and invisibly united; all of them being partakers of the one Spirit, though no longer joined together or acting together in one external body.

The object of the present work is to analyse and enquire into this most important subject, and to ascertain whether the said theory is so well founded, that men may trust their immortal souls for all eternity to the conclusions which they derive from it.

Division
of
the subject.

The subject will be divided into three sections.

In the first I propose, in a cursory and general manner, to assign reasons for belief in the necessity of visible unity in the Church, and in its actual and

permanent continuance, showing where it must be looked for, and may be found, at the present day.

In the second, I propose to examine more particularly into the previously mentioned theory of the existence of invisible unity under outward division, as set forth by Dr. Pusey, in the 'Eirenicon,' and by Dr. Forbes, the Anglican Bishop of Brechin, in his 'Explanation of the Nicene Creed,' and as generally maintained by the more advanced members of the same communion.

The third section, which will form the largest portion of the work, will be devoted to the consideration of a few of the most prominent instances brought forward by the above-mentioned writers from ecclesiastical history in support of the theory in question; treating particularly of the differences between St. Victor and the Asiatics; of those between St. Stephen on the one side, and St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian on the other; of the divisions at Antioch, in which the great St. Meletius was so intimately concerned; and lastly, of the divergence of the Celtic churches in Britain, on certain points of discipline, from the Roman and general ecclesiastical usages.

Throughout the whole discussion I shall not shrink from the examination of any apparently adverse fact, and never will I conceal or compromise any truth.

My object is not controversy, but concord. If at times I express myself strongly, I will never write bitterly. If I shrink not from exposing error, it shall not be in a spirit of provocation. If I must

The spirit
of
the work.

Jerem. vi. 16.

say what is unpalatable, I ask for indulgence if it be true. I have no new theories to unfold, no schemes of human prudence to propound, for such have not the promise—‘Thus saith the Lord: Stand ye on the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, which is the good way, and walk ye in it: and you shall find refreshment for your souls.’

Advantage of
friendly discussion.

Until recently there has existed amongst the more advanced members of the Church of England, a manifest shrinking from the free and open discussion of these important subjects. The ice has, at last, to some extent been broken, and it is evident that if men really desire re-union, they will give both a patient hearing and a patient answer to the ‘other side;’ if they truly love truth and peace, they will not be deterred from the pursuit of them by any whispers of prejudice, or by any subtle suggestions (whether from without or from within their own breasts), to close eyes and ears, and to stifle every spirit of investigation. Controversy too often engenders strife, and tends to make hearts harder; but friendly and free discussion gives rise to explanation, and thus conduces to a better understanding. Let it be hoped that the thawing waters will not be suffered again to freeze. Above all, may God protect us from frozen hearts! Better the passing anger of a loving zeal, than the chill stagnation of a fixed estrangement.

I.

Una est columba mea, perfecta mea, una est matris suæ.

Cant. Cantic. vi. 8.

THE Unity of Christ's Church is divine in its nature and in its origin, as the Holy Gospels testify:—

‘These things Jesus spake, and lifting up his eyes to heaven, He said, Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee. . . . I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me: because they are Thine; and all My things are Thine, and Thine are Mine: and I am glorified in them. And now I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep them in Thy Name, whom Thou hast given Me: *that they may be one, as We also are. . . . And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me. That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee: that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*’

The Church's Unity
is from
God.

St. John xvii.

No union which is merely human could satisfy this prayer. No confederacy of independent churches could fulfil the prophecy which it conveys. It asks for and by asking it foretells a living unity of heart and soul and creed, amongst men of every nation and every clime, so long as the world shall last; a unity never witnessed upon earth, excepting in the Church of Christ. This unity is the supernatural mark and

Ps. lxxvii. 7.

proof of the abiding presence of that 'God Who maketh men of one manner to dwell in a house.' As such it was prayed for by our Blessed Lord. He asked His Father for it as a mark of His Divine mission. To be a mark at all it must be visible. To extend as such to all future believers it must not only be visible, it must be permanent; and it must belong exclusively to those who believe in Him aright. It must be a visible and a never-failing mark and note of His one true Church. Not hidden in its members' hearts, but manifested in their lives and outward communion. It must be an outward as well as an inward Unity, or it would not be visible. It must be inward as well as outward, or it would not be real. The unity of God is both its model and its source. Our Lord Himself has said it. It is a foretaste

St. John xvii.

of glory:—'And the glory which Thou hast given me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as We also are One. I in them, and Thou in Me: that they may be made perfect in one; and the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast also loved Me. . . . And I have made known Thy Name to them, and will make it known: that the love, wherewith Thou hast loved Me, may be in them, and I in them.'

Unity exists.

Has this Divine prayer failed? Have the ages lessened its efficacy? Has this mark of the Church been effaced?

If these things cannot be, then visible Unity must

now exist, an actual and divine reality, which, in the fulness of its life is within the reach of all.

‘God is not as a man, that He should lie, nor as the son of man, that He should be changed. Hath He said then, and will He not do? hath He spoken, and will He not fulfil?’ Numbers xxiii. 19.

Where is our faith if we can imagine that the prayer of Jesus, thus close upon His agony, fell unheeded and was lost? Of Him, who pledged to us His word, that His Father will give us all that we ask for in His Name?

Yet it has been said that man’s sin has broken the outward bond of unity, marred the designs of the eternal God, and effaced from His spouse this note of her election. Man’s sin once brought the deluge. God’s promise renders us fearless of its return, even when the world goes after Antichrist. Man’s sin is now as impotent to destroy God’s bright creation, as man’s best efforts would be impotent to create.

Unity
unimpaired
by
sin of man.

Come what may, ‘all the days of the earth, seed time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, night and day, shall not cease,’ for God has said it. Happen what will, the visible unity of the One Church on the One Rock, of the One Light on the One Candlestick, of the One City on God’s own Hill, of the One body of the faithful united in the Chair of Peter, shall never fail, upheld by Christ’s prayer, and by His promise:—‘Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.’ Gen. viii. 22.

St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

God loved the world when He first created it and pronounced it good. God loved the world when it lay before Him, cleansed with the awful baptism of the deluge. But what was this love of His natural creation, compared with that which He bears to the new creation of His grace? What His love for the globe thus washed with water, compared to that with which He loves the mystic spouse of His dear Son, rising pure and spotless from the deluge of His passion, from the washing of His blood? Sooner shall winter and summer, seed time and harvest, fail, and cease to gladden man's heart, than God shall suffer the beacon light of His Church—the one sure guide of man into the haven of eternal life—to become uncertain. Never will He permit the human race He loves so well to be perplexed and misled by an outwardly divided Church, giving scattered tokens and opposing signals, lights manifold and divergent, because posted on hills widely severed in their summits, albeit they may seem to touch each other at the base.

Circumstances
of
our Lord's prayer
for Unity.

All the circumstances of the divine prayer for Unity demand attention. Why should our Lord have offered it up so publicly? Why should He have caused it to be handed down to all generations, in the gospel? No word or act of His was without its meaning, and its teaching, and its power. Had the prayer been made in silence, in the stillness and the darkness of Gethsemani, its power would have been the same; but its meaning and its teaching

would have been withheld from us. Whereas its publicity, and its marked solemnity of form, time, and place, reveal a special purpose. Our Lord desired by that prayer to teach us, as well as to procure us, the visible Unity of His Church.

Public
for
our sakes.

When the stone was taken away from the tomb of Lazarus, before raising him to life, 'Jesus lifting up His eyes' (the selfsame expression) 'said: Father, I give Thee thanks that Thou hast heard me.'

St. John xi. 41, 42.

Our Lord explains why He said this;—'And I knew,' He immediately adds, 'that Thou hearest me always, *but because of the people who stand about have I said it*; that they may believe that Thou hast sent me.' The motive (*that they may believe that Thou hast sent me*) was the same as in the prayer for Unity. Had the thanks been offered in secret, had Lazarus been secretly resuscitated, the miracle, though truly wrought, would not have availed as a public sign of our Lord's mission from His Father. Had the prayer for Unity been offered in private, or had that Unity been merely inward (to conceive an impossibility), its testimony to the divinity of our Lord's mission would not have been manifest. If all the divided communions which profess belief in Christ belong to that body of the faithful for whose unity Christ prayed, then the testimony which He asked for cannot have been given.

At another time when, troubled in soul, our blessed Lord exclaimed:—'Father, glorify Thy Name,' a voice responded from heaven:—'I have

St. John xii. 27-30.

both glorified it, and will glorify it again : ’ and Jesus said :—‘ This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes.’

So is it for man’s sake that His thrice-hallowed prayer for Unity is published and proclaimed with the world-wide gospel, and shall be throughout all time.

Expressly
for all time.

The prayer itself is *expressly* for all time ; and therefore the Unity which it obtained must be perpetual, and can never be suspended. On various occasions our Lord addressed His disciples in words which are universally understood to apply to all future generations, although not so expressed. But in this mysterious prayer for visible Unity he expressly mentions us, ourselves, and all who are to follow us, so long as time shall last ; nay, for all eternity ; for charity and Unity shall never fail. He takes most loving pains to mention us. His Unity is to be our own portion, not merely that of His early followers. It was to be everlasting as Himself ; not to fail after a few centuries. He prays for those around Him, and then He adds :—

St. John xvii.

‘ Not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me : that they all may be one, as Thou Father, in Me, and I in Thee : that they also may be one in Us : that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. . . . I in them, and Thou in Me ; that they may be made perfect in one ; and the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast also loved Me.’

One in God, and as God, one in time and in eternity. Visibly and invisibly, outwardly and inwardly, really, truly, divinely ‘*made perfect in one!*’ Oh heritage of heaven, never will we abandon Thee! Thou never-failing mark and witness of the love of the Father, the mission of the Son, and the abiding presence of the Spirit! ‘One in Us!’ O stupendous mystery of love! O sweetest words of power! Dearer ‘than gold and many precious stones: sweeter than honey and the honey-comb!’ The tongue can never tire of speaking them, nor the ear weary of their repetition. The heart loves them, and lingers on them; it ponders over them, and chews them in the cud of mental prayer. Like the peace of God, they surpass all human sense.—*Exsuperant omnem sensum.*

Philipp. iv. 7.

I ask again, Has this divine prayer failed and come to nought? Has this earnest blood-confirmed petition of our God, made man, gone up to heaven and come back unanswered or refused? Was His strong cry in vain? Could *Jesus* pray in vain? At the tomb of Lazarus, before He raised the dead, He addressed His Father and He said,—‘I knew that Thou hearest Me always.’ Was His eucharistic dying prayer to be the one exception?

The prayer of
Jesus
could not fail.

Again I ask, Has He not pledged His word that what we pray for in His Name shall be granted to us? In His discourse of that same night, which preceded His prayer for Unity, He said to those assembled:—‘Amen, amen, I say to you: if you ask the Father anything in My Name, He will give it

St. John xvi. 23, 24.

you. Hitherto you have not asked anything in My name. Ask, and you shall receive: that your joy may be full.'

If, then, He declared that His Father always hears Him; if He promised as regards each one of us that all we ask through Him shall be bestowed upon us; it is inconceivable, it would be blasphemy to say, that this one prayer alone has fallen short of its full effects. Our poor prayers indeed may still be wanting in conditions essential to their acceptance; but we know that the prayer of Christ at least, was perfect. If Jesus prays in vain, which of us can hope for mercy?

Romans iii. 4.

'But God is true: and every man a liar, as it is written: *That Thou mayest be justified in Thy words, and mayest overcome when Thou art judged.*'—

St. Mark xiii. 31.

'Heaven and earth,' said our Lord, after His prophecy on the Mount of Olivet, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.'

This divine prayer then, is a pledge to us of the perpetual visible Unity of the Church of Christ; and such Unity is an abiding mark that Christ is with her, and a testimony that He is God.

Unity implies
visible
intercommunion.

The assertion that, through oneness in Christ the Head, invisible Unity may exist between religious bodies without visible intercommunion, seems to confound the position of such bodies with that of individual Christians in invincible ignorance.

There can be no union with Christ excepting

through the Church. It is by baptism that men become members of Christ, and baptism, by whomsoever administered, is a sacrament of the one Church. It therefore renders each one on whom it is conferred a child of that only Church, and entails upon him all the duties involved in that relation. It is to that one visible Church that he must look for the other sacraments of Christ; it is from her teaching he must learn the faith of Christ; it is to her that his obedience is due, and his sole allegiance. St. Augustine sees a figure of this in the women of old, the wives of Abraham and Jacob, the children of whose handmaids were reckoned as their own, because begotten by their own husbands; as, in baptism, Christ begets children to the Church, even though it be outside her. But the same holy doctor teaches also, and no less distinctly, that such baptism is of no avail for those who incur the guilt of remaining outside her, apart from her visible communion. By thus cutting themselves off from her, they cut themselves off from Christ. She is one with Christ, and if they are not hers, they are not His; for she is the only appointed means of our union with Christ.

St. Augustine says, ‘The Church in fact brings forth all, by baptism, whether in herself, that is, from her own womb, or outside herself by the seed of her husband: (either by herself or by a handmaid).’ He adds that Esau, though born of the true wife, was separated from God’s people through

It is
through the Church
that
we are united
to Christ.

Lib. i. de Bapt.
cont. Donat.
cap. xv. n. 23.

Genesis xxx. 13. fraternal dissension ; whilst Aser, born of a handmaid, but by the right of the wife, received the promises through fraternal concord. ‘ Thus, ’ he says, ‘ amongst those ’ (outside the Church) ‘ all who are born are born by the right of the Church which resides in baptism.’ *Sicut apud istos Ecclesie jure quod est in Baptismo, nascuntur quicumque nascuntur.* If they live in her unity (he adds) they shall reach the land of promise ; but if they persevere in dissension, their lot will be with Ismael, who was cast out on account of disagreement with his brother. Elsewhere he states :—‘ We confess that the baptism of Christ profits a man nothing if he is baptized among heretics or schismatics, and attributes to these same, the baptism he is baptized with ; but that it then begins to profit him, when he passes over to the body of Christ, which is the Church of the living God.’ *Fatemur nihil prodesse homini baptismum Christi, si apud hereticos vel schismaticos baptizetur, eis ipsis tribuens baptismum quo baptizatur ; sed tunc ei prodesse incipere, cum transit ad corpus Christi, quod est Ecclesia Dei vivi.*—He is speaking of all those who, being separated from the Catholic Church, their true mother, are responsible for remaining so. It is however held that there may be the exceptional case of the outward separation of individual Christians from the body of the Church, through no fault of their own, while they are actually although invisibly united with what has been termed by theologians the Church’s soul.

Lib. ii.
cont. Crescon. Donat.
cap. xxviii. n. 34.

There are many who, through circumstances over which they have had no control, are outwardly separated from the visible body of Christ; and, thank God, the hope may be indulged that amongst them there are individuals who are prevented by ignorance alone, from availing themselves of the means which God puts within the reach of all for the knowledge of His saving truth. If such persons are ready and disposed at any cost to embrace in full the revelation of God which they have hitherto learnt but in part; if their hearts are prepared to submit to that Church from which ignorance of her divine authority alone keeps them asunder; then, blessed be God, such true souls may be accounted as really, though invisibly, united to the soul of the Church, though deprived of the privilege of her outward communion; and, therefore, as really members of Christ. But no one can presume to judge in any particular case. God alone can read the heart. God alone can discern among those outwardly separated from His only fold, who do or who do not belong to it by this inward bond; for He alone can tell how far each one has done his part to learn His truth, and to know and obey His will.

We have the repeated authority of the Angelic Doctor for asserting, that the mercy of God will not suffer any one to be left without the necessary means for salvation, even in the case of the outwardly unbaptized and heathen. To cite but one out of several passages. In treating of the necessity

of a certain degree of explicit belief, he says, that no difficulty can be raised against this doctrine from the case of any who may have been 'brought up in forests or among brute beasts':—

S. Thom. Aquin.
De Veritate,
quaest. xiv. De Fide,
Art. xi.

'For it appertains to Divine Providence to provide for every one all that is necessary to salvation, so long as the person opposes no impediment on his side. For if any one so brought up should follow the guidance of natural reason in striving after good and avoiding evil, it is most surely to be held (*certissime est tenendum*) that, either by internal inspiration God would reveal to him those things which are necessary to be believed, or would guide to him some preacher of the faith, as He sent Peter to Cornelius. Acts x.'

Individual
responsibility.

The mercy of God is infinite, but it does not divest any man of his personal responsibility. It is obvious, that the excuse of ignorance will not avail for one who culpably neglects the means which are afforded to enable him to discern and to enter the true Church, or who wilfully turns aside and shuts his eyes and ears. Nor yet, for one who has doubted the safety of his position, and has not thoroughly examined it; for such a doubt was God's messenger. Men must answer for each such call before their Maker and their Judge Who alone can read the heart.

Human respect.

It is a fearful thought how many trust their souls unhesitatingly to the word of their fellow-men; receiving as God's truth the mere assertion of some individual clergyman, whose learning, or whose zeal and piety, has won their hearts and captivated their understandings. Roman Catholics are

accused of creature worship, which they abhor. How appalling is the extent to which it prevails outside the Church's pale! How appalling the number of men and women who stake their immortal souls for all eternity on the word of some fellow-creature! No Catholic could suffer himself with a safe conscience to be ruled and guided on such a matter, by the simple dictum of any individual whatsoever. He learns indeed the faith from the teachers set over him by the Church, and obeys them as her representatives. But so soon as he should find one of them contradicting another on any essential point, his suspicions would be aroused; and he would at once ascertain from some sure source what was really the divine teaching. No priest or bishop could with a safe conscience permit any more than this, or claim to speak with a mere personal voice on any point of faith; or to affix his own interpretation to any teaching of the Church; or to rule and finally decide any question which might arise as to what that teaching is.¹ God in His mercy has given 'some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors: for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' We are commanded to obey our prelates, to be subject to them, and to follow their faith, and our divine Lord tells us that in hearing them we hear Himself; but this

Eph. iv. 11.

Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

St. Luke x. 16.

¹ Of course, I except (throughout) the case of the Supreme Pontiff, when speaking *ex cathedrâ*.

applies to individual clergy only so far as they speak the same thing with the whole body throughout the universe. Otherwise, says St. Paul,—‘ Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a Gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.’ This shows the necessity of the living, ever present voice of the Holy Spirit in the Church; by means of which it may at once be made apparent, should any individual pastor speak that which is his own, and not of Jesus Christ—‘ You are bought with a price, be not made the bond slaves of men.’—‘ *Let every one prove his own work*, and so shall he have glory in himself only, and not in another. *For every one shall bear his own burden.*’

Gal. i. 8.

1 Cor. vii. 23.

Gal. vi. 4, 5.

Heb. xiii. 17.

Our prelates ‘ watch as being to render an account of our souls ;’ yet each one of us must individually answer to God for his own soul.

Corporate bodies
of
Christians.

The Church is formed of single and separate individual persons, either outwardly and visibly hers, or else belonging to her inward soul in virtue of the exception above referred to, of invincible ignorance. But there can be no *society* of individuals, no corporate body of Christians, which can possibly be united with the Church of Christ, without visible intercommunion. This is evident from the very nature of the case. We have seen that our Lord prayed for permanent visible unity, as a mark of His Divine mission. Now two separate societies, each claiming to be His, and neither of them in outward communion with

the other, would present the spectacle of visible division, and therefore His words would not be verified if both of them belonged to His Church. Both could not be from Him. If Unity is to be visible, we must decide between the two, for one only can make good the claim to His abiding presence. Such is the case before us. Is Christ divided? Can the same Spirit say one thing in Rome, and another thing in England?

Unity implies one Church alone, as the visible channel for God's grace. Christ is One, and He is the source of all grace and salvation to mankind. His Body is One. His Spirit is One. His faith is one. The Church is His messenger, the one appointed teacher of His truth, and stewardess of His sacraments. This Church, and this Church's baptism by whomsoever administered, are each of them visibly one. If it be not so, our Lord must have prayed in vain, and the prophecy must have failed which told that He was to die, 'not only for the nation, but to gather together in one the children of God, that were dispersed;' or, according to the Psalmist—'*In conveniendo populos in unum, et reges ut serviant Domino.*'

No society of Christians on earth which is not in outward communion with this one visible Church of Christ, can possess authority to dispense the sacraments, or to preach the faith. For the one Spirit animates one body only, and speaks with one only voice.

The first step is to affirm this fact, and the actual and

There is
only one Church.

St. John xi. 52.

Ps. ci. 23.

perpetual existence of the visible Unity of the Church. The next is to ascertain where that Church is to be found. With God's assistance, it is an easy task, or rather it would be so but for three centuries of prejudice; prejudice the more beguiling, because mixed up with so many hallowed feelings, and with venerated religious teachings from the early days of childhood.

The true Church
is not hidden
under a bushel.

The one visible Catholic Church being to us what the ark of Noe was to the drowning world, the only appointed means of our salvation, it would be manifestly inconsistent with the mercy, and even with the justice, of God, to leave mankind in uncertainty as to which, among the various communities of Christians, is really the mystical body of His Son, and the only guide to heaven. When the Divine mind, in Its awful simplicity and most loving wisdom, planned and willed the salvation of the human race, It never can have intended that, in these last days, the very path that leads to heaven should become hidden under the mists of doubt, and rendered undiscernible amid the conflicting claims of rival parties. If it were so, then must our Lord's Gospel have lost its characteristic mark, that it is preached to the poor. If it be necessary to enter into a recondite study of history and the early fathers, and to examine with nicety into disputed questions extending over a period of more than eighteen centuries and a half, in order to ascertain which of the contending bodies of Christians is really the teacher come from God; then, indeed, it is evident that Christianity cannot have been the

religion contemplated by the prophet when he foretold :—

‘God Himself will come and will save you. Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall be free: for waters are broken out in the desert, and streams in the wilderness. . . . And a path and a way shall be there, and it shall be called the holy way: the unclean shall not pass over it, and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein.’

Isaias xxxv. 4-8.

‘In the last days,’ says the same prophet, ‘the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go, and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for the law shall come forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. . . . O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord.’

Is. ii. 2-5.

This passage appears to point directly to the Apostolic see—the new Jerusalem—the city of the great King; for where else do all nations now go up? The prophet Micheas uses the self-same language.

Mich. iv. 1, 2.

Thus speaks the sure word of prophecy, not obscurely, but, as the Lord said to Habacuc,—‘Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables: that he that readeth it may run over it.’

Hab. ii. 2.

St. John Chrysostom says :—‘Neither the sun, nor the sun’s light, is so plain, as what regards the Church. For the *house of the Lord is on the tops of the*

St. John
Chrysostom
Hom. on Is. ii. n. 2.

mountains.'¹ And again :—' It is an easier thing for the sun to be quenched, than for the Church to be made invisible.'²

St. Matt. v. 13, 14.

This is that Church which our Lord designates as 'the salt of the earth'—'the light of the world,' adding :—'A city seated on a mountain cannot be

St. Luke xvii. 24.

hid.' He tells us that,—'As the lightning that lighteth from under heaven, shineth unto the parts that are under heaven, so shall the Son of man be in His

S. Athanasius
in Psalm lxxxviii. 38.

day.' 'The Church of Christ,' as St. Athanasius comments on the Psalmist, 'shall shine like the lightning, and enlighten all under heaven, and shall abide unceasingly, like the sun and the moon.'

S. Aug.
cont. lit. Petil.
lib. ii. n. 74.

St. Augustine declares :—'THE TRUE CHURCH is hidden from no one. Hence comes that which He Himself says in the Gospel :—"A city planted on a mountain cannot be hid." Wherefore it is said in the Psalm :—*He*

P's. xviii. 6.

hath set His tabernacle in the sun; that is, in manifestation.' Again, to the Donatist Severinus, he writes, as a Catholic might write to an Anglican :—

S. Augustini
Ep. lii. ad Severinum.

'How deplorable it is that we, who are brethren in the flesh, live not in the body of Christ in one society, especially since it is easy for thee to give heed to and see the city placed upon a mountain, concerning which the Lord says in the Gospel, that it cannot be hid. For it is the Catholic Church itself, whence in Greek it is called *καθολική*, since it is spread throughout the whole world. To no one is it allowed to be ignorant of this Church, therefore (*ideo*), according to the word of our Lord Jesus Christ, it cannot be hid.'

¹ Quoted by Waterworth, *Faith of Catholics*, vol. i. p. 235.

² *Ibid.* p. 198, as from T. vi. Hom. iv. n. 2.

Our moral sense at once rejects the idea that our Blessed Lord, Who ‘came into this world to save sinners,’ can have left His Church without credentials sufficient for all who desire that salvation. For to her alone he gave the commission to preach His Gospel, and to administer His saving sacraments.

I. Tim. i. 15.

Now, in fact, there is but one community of Christians which visibly fulfils that commission; or which bears, prominently in all her conduct, and manifestly to the eyes of all men, the charter of her divine authority and power, conveyed to her by the words of Christ:—

Manifest claims
of
Rome.

‘And Jesus coming spoke to them, saying: All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.

St. Matt. xxviii.
18–20.

‘Going therefore teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,

‘Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.’

The authority to teach which is conveyed by this commission is given to none besides that body of men to whom it is addressed. It extends throughout all time and over all nations, and it regards not only faith, but practice—‘Teaching them,’ says Christ, ‘to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.’ He adds a promise to be always with that body to the end, and thus ensures to it a never-failing infallibility, which His command to teach, indeed, of itself conveys, for no mere fallible teaching could be relied upon as divine.

Christ's
commission to
His Church.

It is only
Rome
which acts
on this commission.

It cannot be denied that the Roman Catholic Church is the one only community of Christians which practically manifests faith in this divine commission, and whose faith and whose claim have received the corroborative testimony of the world-wide, everlasting, workings of Divine Providence in her behalf. There may be others who claim to be the One Church, others who style themselves Apostolic, or Catholic, others who call themselves infallible; but there is none other which, in the strength and by the command of the Lord God, goes forth in all the beauty and power of holiness to teach and to rule the consciences and hearts of men over the face of the whole globe, and to guide and control their moral actions. Sweetly and strongly and surely she advances onward, like her Lord in the vision,—‘conquering that He might conquer.’ Conquering all hearts for Him! The very by-words of reproach which are heaped upon her by the world, testify to this most evident truth. Her enemies say that she is aggressive and exclusive—a claimant to infallibility and to rule. And they say true. She is so, and Christianity is so. She is the very personification of Christianity, which is one, and aggressive, and infallible, and has a rule to which no earthly monarch can approach, the rule over men’s hearts, and therefore the world hates it. Rome *is* all this, and she *acts* accordingly, as none other dares to act; if she did not do so, by that very fact she would be self-condemned, as all her pretended rivals are; for not one of them fulfils these duties, which are nevertheless

Apoc. vi. 2.

inherent in Christ's commission. That commission was addressed to one only body of men ; it was, therefore, exclusive. It commanded them to teach Christ's faith, and to cause His commandments to be observed throughout all nations ; therefore, it was aggressive. The command not only gave infallibility by its own virtue and in itself, for otherwise it could not have been obeyed, but there was also expressly connected with it a promise of the Divine assistance, for all time :—*'Behold I am with you all days.'* Therefore Christ's Church must always be infallible, and always practically assert herself to be so, and none can be Christ's Church which fails, in practice, to claim infallibility, since it is essential in order to command men's faith. Cursed is he that trusts in man. Unless a Church makes known that she speaks with the infallibility of an ever-present God, what claim has she on man's belief? Men could not trust their souls to one whose voice was not the voice of God.

The whole commission was conferred for the salvation of mankind, and the one who possesses it can therefore never cease to proclaim it and to act upon it, for otherwise mankind could not profit by it. Rome alone both proclaims it and acts on it. Therefore the world calls her arrogant ; and the good see in her, visibly, the teacher both promised and sent from God. It was so with her Divine Master ; it will be so till the end ; and it is a characteristic of the truth. Hers alone is that universal empire, universal alike in time and in extent, which the prophecies proclaim

Ps. ii. 8.

as the heritage of Christ and of His spouse. It is hers because it is His. On Him are bestowed ‘the Gentiles for His inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for His possession;’ and she alone it is who, in every clime, in every nation, asserts this rule of love; extends this spiritual kingdom; and with the consciousness of God’s authority demands an undivided allegiance of the heart from every soul of man; calling him, if heathen, into her fold; if Christian, to her maternal bosom, by whomsoever he may have been baptized, or wheresoever he may be found. I say again, whatever others may hold in theory, it is a visible fact, that, in practice and in reality, the Roman Catholic Church alone maintains and urges those necessary claims which form a portion of the very charter of Christianity. All others, in their conduct, if not in their words, say practically:—This exclusive, universal, unerring rule is not for me! Therefore it is that the world hates none of them as it hates the One Church of God, and as it hated the One Christ.

Dan. ii. 44.

St. John x. 16.

Here, then, is the house of the Lord on the top of the mountains; ‘the kingdom that shall never be destroyed;’ ‘the one fold under the one shepherd.’ Here alone are united the four notes of Christ’s true Church, defined in the Nicene Creed:—*Credo Unam Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.*

The
Church’s Unity.

The unity of the Blessed Trinity is the pattern of the Church’s unity.—‘One as We also are One.’—

Such was the prayer of our Lord to His Father. This unity, therefore, must be complete, and of a divine intensity. It could not subsist without the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost, uniting the many members of Christ's mystical body to each other and to God, by the threefold bond of one faith, one hope, one love. Without such unity the Church could not fulfil her office. She has received God's commission to teach the nations. She could not do so if she spoke with a divided voice. Her pastors could not preach one faith unless, being divinely taught, they were at one amongst themselves as to the articles of that faith.

The consideration of the absence of such agreement between the established English Church and Rome, might seem sufficient to dispel the dream of any real though unseen unity between those two communions. It is idle to reply that they are agreed on fundamentals. They are not even agreed as to what fundamentals are. For the present I need go no further than the article of faith, which declares the divine authority of the see of St. Peter, to rule, and govern, and teach the universal Church. This is a fundamental doctrine of the Roman creed. The national Church of England is based on the principle of its rejection. Surely there cannot be any unity of spirit between two societies which contradict each other on a point of faith, as to the essential constitution of the Church itself. Such contradiction affects the very essence and ground work of Christian

Rome
and
England.

faith, which consists in the belief of everything that God has revealed, because He has revealed it. This faith, therefore, requires certainty respecting the appointed channel of God's revelation, and any difference respecting the definition of that channel is incompatible with unity of faith. One who is convinced by his own private judgment of the truth of all the Roman Catholic doctrines, save that of the infallibility of the Church in subjection to the Roman See, cannot have divine faith in all those truths, nor be, even so far, one in the faith with those who believe them because they have been revealed by God through His Church.

External
differences among
members
of
the Church.

Superficial writers have professed to discern marks of a want of unity among Roman Catholics, in the passing external differences or dissensions which occasionally meet the eye. One might imagine it had escaped their notice that Catholics do not deny that they are frail and erring mortals, and liable, like others, to all the ills this flesh is heir to. We do not profess to be individually exempt from human weakness and human faults, although we glory in the strength of a divine presence, whose 'power is made perfect in infirmity.' We are but men; but 'in the midst of us is Christ our God'! The Church is an abiding miracle. From its very commencement, its whole life is a testimony to the power of God displayed through weak and erring instruments. If her members were already supernaturally perfect, the miracle would cease. So long as they remain

II. Cor. xii. 9.

imperfect, it is impossible that their imperfections can escape notice. But these imperfections are individual; these dissensions or differences between man and man, or between one section of men and another within the Church's pale, no more affect the divine unity of the whole body, than the wind which ruffles the surface of the ocean affects the oneness of its universal waters.

I am speaking of differences amongst the good. The Church on earth comprises a mixed multitude, and will do so till the end of all things. Between good and evil, wherever they are found, there must always be a contest. Yet even Catholics of bad moral conduct do not differ from the good as to points of faith; or as to the rule of life which they know they ought to follow. So that however inconsistent their behaviour, they manifest no divergence of doctrine. Nor can any such divergence be gathered from the differences which frequently arise amongst the morally good. It has happened, indeed, that good men have been led astray, in opinion, as was the great Fenelon; but like Fenelon also they have submitted when their error was condemned. Any who, in such case, persist, are manifestly unsound members; and some, like Lammenais, have fallen, and have cut themselves off from unity. But such cases of defection, however sad, whether of individuals or of multitudes, do not impair in the slightest the unity of the Church they have disobeyed. The tree continues one, though the storm may rend its branches.

It has happened, too, that matters in themselves indifferent, have occasionally assumed an importance not their own through their connection with particular interests, and have been argued so warmly on both sides as to induce authority to interfere and forbid all further discussion upon the subject. To this class belong the questions as to whether the prophet Elias was the founder of the Carmelites; and as to the form of the habit worn by St. Francis; which at one time were sources of contention.

Inconsistency
of the
charges against
the
Catholic system.

St. Luke
vii. 31-35.

So long as men are men, these things will be; and on this subject, as on most others, the Church can adopt the language of her Master:—‘And the Lord said: Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like? They are like to children sitting in the market-place, and speaking one to another, and saying: We have piped to you, and you have not danced: we have mourned, and you have not wept. For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and you say: He hath a devil. The Son of Man is come eating and drinking; and you say: Behold a man that is a glutton and a drinker of wine, a friend of publicans and sinners. And wisdom is justified by all her children.’

If Roman Catholics point to their world-wide agreement on all essentials, they are charged with the rigid immobility of enforced dogma; with a Procrustean system ready cut and dried. If they exhibit signs of movement and of thought, and show a con-

sequent difference of opinion, they are forthwith accused of internal divisions and suicidal discord. But 'wisdom is justified by all her children.' The greater the activity of men's thoughts, the more numerous will be their differences of opinion on every conceivable subject,—history, science, art, politics, and even (as regards open questions) on points of theology itself. Hence spring the friendly controversies on such matters between one school and another, one religious order and another, one theologian and another, all equally faithful to the one true Church—all equally united in her outward and inward communion. She approves of such discussions (which, so long as they are conducted in a spirit of charity and deference to authority, are most serviceable to truth), whilst, like a watchful mother she looks on, and keeps them within due bounds. Men naturally have different opinions also on matters of taste and feeling, on external forms and styles of devotion, on the decoration of churches, on architecture, ritual, and the rest, and even on the line of conduct to be followed under the circumstances of the day. Differences existed in the apostolic age; nay, they sprang up even between apostles. The dissension which arose between St. Paul and St. Barnabas was such that 'they departed one from another.' Yet unity was not impaired, though the difference was so serious; for they continued one in the faith, and in the visible commu-

Acts xv. 39.

II. Cor. iv. 7.

nion of the Church. Such differences form one of the troubles of our lot on earth ; but if these miseries did not exist in her, the Church would not be human, and if they penetrated below the surface, she could not be divine. She has her 'treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency may be of the power of God, and not of herself.' The very existence of these occasional external differences amongst her members is a test of her divine mission. If God were not within her, man's weakness would have turned such dissension into division long centuries ago. As it is, they are but on the surface, and only partial even there ; arising often from some local cause, or peculiar circumstance, and therefore frequently far shorter-lived than are the men themselves who take part in them.

The
universal
Unity of
the
Catholic Church.

The enquirer after truth may search throughout the world ; he may travel north, south, east, and west ; visit Europe, Asia, Africa, and America ; go through France, Spain, Italy, Germany, England, Ireland, Scotland, the Arctic regions, and the Antipodes ; he may go everywhere, and ask every Catholic he meets, cleric or layman, religious or secular, Benedictine, Augustinian, Franciscan, Dominican, Jesuit, Carmelite, or any other ; young or old, learned or unlearned, all who have been taught the rudiments of their religion, he may ask them respecting their faith, respecting their practice, respecting the sacraments and all that concerns religion, and, from one and all, the answer will be the same. Everywhere on the face

of the globe, amongst good and pious Roman Catholics, though they may be utter strangers to each other in the flesh, and divided in temporal position as far as men can be divided from their fellow-men, there will be found one and the self-same faith, one and the self-same rule of morals, the self-same sacraments, and the self-same belief respecting those sacraments; there will be found but one mind, one heart, and one voice, as regards all the doctrines and commandments of the Church. This is unity, and it is divine; it is no mere human coincidence or contrivance. The finger of God is here, reversing the confusion of Babel. It is the unity of God's one Church throughout the universal globe; and it has been her unity through more than eighteen centuries and a half. It is a matter to be looked to, and a test to be applied, for the absence of such unity denotes the absence of God. He cannot speak with a divided tongue; He dwells not amid contradictions; He is everywhere one and the same.—
 'His place is in peace: and His abode in Sion:' in the city He has constituted as the one fold under one shepherd:—*Jerusalem, quæ edificatur ut civitas; cujus participatio ejus in idipsum.*

Ps. lxxv. 2.

Ps. cxxi. 3.

God's Church is holy: holy with the holiness of supernatural grace. This clothes her with a brightness that wholly covers the short-comings of too many of her children, who, though in her, unhappily testify by their lives, that they are not

Sanctity.

of her. Our Lord has warned us of this scandal. But in spite of it she is pre-eminently holy, and manifestly so to the whole world. Natural goodness may be found elsewhere; but that superhuman lustre that shines like the stars of heaven, can glisten in her firmament alone. Who can count that royal list of saints, nobler than earth's noblest, who glory in her as a mother? Derived from every rank and every calling, from every clime and every language; from the fisherman at his nets, and the publican at his office, to the monarch on the throne, and the philosopher in the schools. Now a simple shepherdess, now a noble matron, or high-exalted queen, now a converted sinner; it would be endless to recount the varieties or to tell the names of all the heroes and heroines of sanctity, whose acts adorn the robes of that one holy Church still ruled over and fed by Peter in his successors. To pass by the early ages, where else will be found a St. Elizabeth of Hungary, a St. Louis of France, a St. Clare, a St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi, a St. Margaret of Cortona, a St. Ignatius of Loyola, a St. Francis Xavier, a St. Edward Confessor, a St. Thomas of Canterbury, a St. Theresa, a St. Rose of Lima, and countless others? Where else can be found the bright-robed army of martyrs down even to the present age? All the miraculous creations of God's grace belong exclusively to the Roman communion.

External testimony. Nay, Anglicans themselves being witnesses,—to what source do they turn when endeavouring to revive

former holiness of life? To whom do they look for a pattern but to the holy Roman Church? It is her ritual, her forms, her sacraments, her doctrine (save on the few essential points which they reject), her religious orders, her works of mercy, her devotions to a great extent, that they seek to adapt to their own use. For this they gladly bear reproach, for this they toil. They fly to Rome for well nigh everything but the sweet protection and shadowing tender care of her maternal authority. This holds true, though not in the same measure, of every school which has yearned after greater holiness,—of every effort after a higher standard of religious life. It holds true of the so-called evangelicals; for though they thought not of it, yet in their teaching on the necessity of prayer and meditation; on the passion of our blessed Lord, and on the great mysteries of man's redemption; in their zeal for maintaining the essential doctrines of the incarnation and divinity of Christ; in the spirituality of their religion; in their pious lives and active labours; in all these respects they followed in the track of that very Rome, whom in their blindness they looked upon as anti-christian. This holds true of all earnest Christian teaching and practice. The Church of Rome has throughout been the guardian of the saving truths of Christianity. History has recorded the fact in pages which can never be effaced. The Church of Rome kept alive, through ages of iron, the sacred fire of the true religion of the heart; the adoration of God in spirit and in truth; earnestness and piety of life;

the burning love of Jesus ; an apostolic zeal rendered the more sure and efficacious by discipline, and by the superhuman prudence and discretion which regulates and directs it. The source of every really religious movement may be traced to the fostering care of Rome. If Rome could be abstracted from Christendom, and from Christendom's history, how much of Christendom would be left? If Rome's teaching and Rome's practices were to be abstracted from Christianity ; in other words, if from every communion of Christians there were to be taken away all that is there held in common with Rome, what then would be found remaining? A mere negation! All that is positive would be gone ; there would be left mere human nothingness. On the other hand, if all be supposed to be taken away from Rome which others hold in common with her, the truths and the virtues she would retain must be recognised as fragments of a complete and divine system ; and what was left would prove her title to what was gone, from the evident connection between the two.

Intrinsic, not *imported*, holiness is an essential note of the Church of Christ. She is the channel of holiness and she is holy :—‘*The Most High hath sanctified His own tabernacle. God is in the midst thereof.*’

Ps. xlv. 5, 6.

Catholicity. The Church of Christ is Catholic in time, and
 Adv. Hæres. i. 1, 5. in space also. She is coeval with the world. ‘The beginning of all things,’ says St. Epiphanius, ‘is the Catholic and Holy Church.’ She is to endure for all

ages. 'Behold,' said our Lord, 'I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' In extent she knows no limits, save the *orbis terrarum*. 'Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature.' Such is her charter from Christ. Her realm reaches on beyond the grave, and death does not sever her children from her. Her mission is to the whole human race, irrespective of human nationalities. Her empire is universal; it comprises all mankind. She is neither French, English, German, nor Spanish; nor is she Asiatic or European, African or American; but still she includes them all: and if she glories in the name of Roman, it is only because Rome is the seat of Peter, and, as St. Ambrose testifies,—*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*.

St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

St. Mark xvi. 15.

In Ps. xl. n. 30.

Peter is everywhere, and the Church is everywhere; her kingdom is not of this world, but it absorbs all earthly kingdoms in its spiritual dominion, which is extended over the whole globe. Besides the many countries in professed communion with Rome, in every nation and in every clime the faith of Peter is proclaimed, the authority of Peter has its willing subjects, and the bark of Peter is present to rescue and to save. Even in lands where schism and heresy prevail, the Church under Peter's rule ceases not to seek the wanderers; to comfort, and support, and cheer the weak. Her children, scattered far and wide over the earth, may not even know each other in the flesh, yet are they one in that omnipresent fold, and known, each one, to that true and careful

Rome
is the centre
of
Catholicity.

mother, who is literally *κατὰ τὸ ὅλον*, for she over-spreads and interpenetrates the universe.

The cross which was erected on Calvary by our Divine Master, was to be planted by His command in the centre of the world—in imperial Rome—by the Apostle whose humility obtained that its position should be reversed; for his high exaltation demanded a corresponding self-abasement. It is in the soil of Rome that the grain of mustard-seed has grown up into the goodly tree, whose roots are nourished by the most precious blood of Jesus, and whose branches have filled the whole earth, so that the birds of the air, even the Saints of God in all lands, find shelter and fruit amongst them.

Title
of
Catholic.

What claim has any religious communion save the Roman to the title of Catholic? As a matter of fact, on what ground can that title be maintained by any other? St. Augustine's and St. Cyril's test will hold good still; for, though it may occasionally happen to an enquirer after a Catholic Church, to fall in with one who makes as if he did not understand him to mean the Roman, such ignorance does not actually exist; it will be a mere pretence. If a Roman Catholic speaks of the Catholic Church, there are those who will make haste to tell him to add Roman, thereby proving how well they understand him: yet the world has not room for two Catholic Churches, if the term Catholic really means universal. It is, however, maintained by Anglicans that the Christians in communion with Rome are only a part of the

Church, and have no right to claim to be the whole. This argument may be answered in the self-same words made use of by St. Augustine to the Donatist Bishop, Petilian :—

‘ You, with closed eyes, so stumble against that mountain, which, from a small stone, according to the prophecy of Daniel, has increased and has filled the whole earth, as to say to us that we have sunk into a part and are not in the whole; to us whose communion is spread abroad over the universal globe. But, in like manner, as if you were to say to me that I am Petilian, I could not tell how to answer you, except by laughing as if you were in joke, or else pitying you as if you were insane, so now, this is all I find to be done. Since, however, I do not believe you are in joke, you see the alternative.’

Contra
Lit. Petil.
lib. ii. No. 91.

God Himself, Who is the model and the maintainer of the Church’s unity, is also the Author of her universality. He has made her as necessary to the spiritual life of man as the sun is to his physical, and, like God’s glorious sun, she shines for all. Of her preachers it is written :—‘ *Their sound is gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world.*’

Romans x. 18.

But ‘ *how shall they preach unless they be sent?*’ The word Apostle means Ambassador. No Church can be Apostolic which is not sent by Christ through His ambassadors, the Apostles. Many of those who admit the necessity of the Apostolical succession as regards orders, appear to make very light of it as regards mission and jurisdiction. It would lead me too far if I were to enter upon the question of the

Apostolicity.
Rom. x. 15.

validity of the Church of England orders. Suffice it to say, that Rome's disbelief in them must be very certain, otherwise she would not unconditionally ordain those Anglican clergymen who, being reconciled to her, are called to her priesthood; for she accounts it sacrilege to repeat the sacrament of orders. But orders do not in themselves contain the Apostolic mission, though they are indispensable in order to render the recipients capable of exercising it when bestowed upon them. Still less do they convey jurisdiction, or confer power upon a priest to administer the sacrament of penance where he does not possess jurisdiction. The confessional is a tribunal, the priest a judge; and this of necessity requires the right of judging in the particular case before him; in other words, of jurisdiction over the penitent. Now, ordination does not convey this jurisdiction, though it confers the power of exercising it when given. No priest can validly exercise the power of the keys, excepting under those circumstances for which he has received jurisdiction from competent ecclesiastical authority. This has always been held in the Church, and both Greeks and Latins are perfectly agreed upon it.¹ Absence of the necessary jurisdiction would invalidate the priestly absolution.

Nor can Bishops themselves exercise jurisdiction beyond the limits assigned to them by Apostolic

Orders
do not give
Mission,
nor confer
Jurisdiction.

¹ *Elementa Theol. Dogmat.* op. F. X. Schoupe, S.J.—Bruxelles, 1863—a most useful and accurate compendium, possessing high recommendations of authority. T. ii. pp 356-7.

authority, which is vested in the Roman Pontiff. If in any case they seem to have done so, it must be presumed that they were authorised, tacitly at the least, by the Apostolic See of Rome; to whose decision, as it is well known, all disputes upon such questions have always been referred.

It is most important to bear in mind that the special privilege and authority divinely conferred on the Apostolic See of St. Peter is one of dignity, and of jurisdiction; not of order. Every Bishop is as much a Bishop as the Pope, as regards the Episcopal *order*; but no other Bishop possesses the dignity or the universal jurisdiction of the Pope, who has succeeded to the plenitude of the Apostolic power and mission conferred by Christ Himself upon St. Peter. The Primacy has been defined by Fr. Schouppe, as—

Definition
of the
Primacy
of the
Roman Pontiff.

Elem. Theol. Dogm.
T. i. pp. 226-7.

‘The pre-eminence by which the Roman Pontiff obtains, by divine right, not only honour and dignity, but also jurisdiction and power, throughout the Universal Church.—It is said: by which he obtains honour and dignity, such, for instance, as that which an Emperor enjoys among Kings who are not his subjects; a man of nobility among commoners; the president of a college among his fellow-colleagues.—It is said: he obtains jurisdiction and power, such, indeed, as any Prince or magistrate enjoys towards subordinate officers: thus, a King holds the primacy among all the Princes who are subject to him.’

It needs but a slight acquaintance with the maxims, rules, and practices of the universal Church, to be aware that rightful jurisdiction was always considered essential for the due exercise of the Episcopal

Necessity
of
rightful jurisdiction.

functions; and that such jurisdiction might be forfeited, or withdrawn by competent authority, though the sacred orders must always remain. Since this is a fact which cannot be contradicted, it surely becomes a matter of supremest moment for English Churchmen to examine and to resolve, not merely the question of the validity of their orders, but that also of the authority and validity of the mission and jurisdiction exercised by their Bishops and clergy at the present time. If they heed the voice of the Universal Church at all, they must be convinced that this is a vital point.¹ The pages of history render it evident beyond a doubt, that the two rival claimants between whom they have to choose, as the respective channels of Divine mission and of spiritual jurisdiction, are; on the one hand,—the Apostolic throne of Peter; and on the other,—the Royal throne of Elizabeth. This is not a rhetorical figure; it is a manifest fact.

Necessity
of
Apostolic Doctrine.

There is a necessary succession of doctrine as well as of orders, and apart from the Apostolic communion we have no guarantee for the Apostolic faith. The Apostles alone received from Christ that great *depositum*, with the assistance of His Spirit to keep it uncorrupt for all time. Now, the Apostolic College is represented to us by its head, and it is to the successors of

¹ This might be urged, on lower ecclesiastical grounds, even apart from the divinely constituted Primacy of St. Peter; as is clearly shown, in an essay deserving of closest attention, by the late Cardinal Wiseman, on *Anglican Claims of Apostolical Succession*. Essays by H.E. Card. Wiseman. Dolman, 1853, vol. ii. p. 161. It first appeared in the *Dublin Review*; Oct. 1838.

the blessed Peter we must look for instruction in the faith once delivered to the Saints. Even apart from this his distinct office, there is no other Apostolic See which God has left upon the earth, in a position for us to consult. The chair of St. Peter alone amongst all the Apostles, by a special privilege still survives to us in a long line of successors; a fact which of itself seems to indicate, that the custody of the faith and the rule of the Church were divinely committed to that favoured See, pre-eminently above the rest.

Amongst
the Apostolic chairs,
St. Peter's
alone remains to us.

To refer to the teaching of Pope Pius VI.:—

‘That the Church was founded by Christ on the firmness of the Rock; and that, by the singular favour of Christ, Peter was selected above the rest to be by vicarious power the Prince of the Apostolic Choir; and therefore to receive the supreme charge and authority, to be perpetuated through his successors for all time, of feeding the whole flock, of confirming his brethren, and of binding and loosing over the whole earth—is a *Catholic Dogma*, which, having been received from the mouth of Christ and handed down and defended by the constant teaching of the Fathers, the Universal Church has always held most inviolably, and frequently confirmed against the errors of innovators by the decrees of Sovereign Pontiffs and Councils.’

Constitution,
28th November, 1786.¹

The Episcopal order is possessed in its fulness without the Apostolate. The Apostolate was possessed in its fulness without the Primacy. The Primacy includes the other two, but yet it is distinct from them. Every

St. Peter's
office.

¹ Quoted in vol. iii. p. 227 of the *Irish Annual Miscellany*, at the commencement of an invaluable Essay on *The Supremacy of St. Peter and his Successors*, by Dr. Murray, Professor of Theology at Maynooth. I thankfully acknowledge my obligations to the said Essay, and earnestly recommend its careful perusal.

Bishop is a true successor of the Apostles, but the extent of his jurisdiction and mission is limited. It is only in council, in union with his fellow-Bishops under the Roman Pontiff, that he collectively exercises wider powers. All the Apostles received from Christ not only the Episcopal order, but also, by a distinct act, universal jurisdiction and universal mission to 'all nations;'—'As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.' These universal powers, which are not conferred on other Bishops, were conferred on each and all of the Apostles, for the purpose of founding the Universal Church. They were to be exercised, however, in union with, and in subordination to, the still higher and distinct office conferred upon St. Peter.

St. Matt. xxviii. 19.
St. John xx. 21.

A.D. 440-461.

Hence the great St. Leo teaches that—

Serm. iv. cap. 2,
in anniv.
ejusdem assumptionis.

'Out of the whole world, Peter alone is chosen, who should be set over both the vocation of the universal nations, and all the Apostles, and all the fathers of the Church: that, although among the people of God there are many priests and pastors; yet Peter, in his own person (*proprie*), may rule all those whom Christ also rules as the Head (*principaliter*). A great and marvellous fellowship in Its own power, most dearly beloved, has the Divine estimation (*dignatio*) conferred upon this man; and if It willed that the other princes should possess anything in common with him, it never, except through him, gave to the others whatever it did not refuse them.'

The
Primacy.

Thus St. Peter received from Christ not only the Episcopal order and the Apostolate in common with the others; but, over and above these princely gifts, he, and he alone, received for himself and his succes-

sors, the supreme office, and the consequent plenitude of power and sufficiency of grace, whereby to feed, to rule, and to govern the Universal Church. As Bishops and as Apostles they all were equal, but as Prince of the Apostles and as Vicar of Christ after His departure, St. Peter was raised above them all.

The Episcopal order is an essential part of the Divine hierarchy of the Church, and must always continue in its plenitude. But the Apostolic work of the foundation of the Church has been accomplished, and so far, therefore, the Apostolate has ceased. That is to say, the universal mission and jurisdiction conferred on each and all of the Apostles has not been continued to their successors, excepting in the case of their head, the blessed Peter. The Apostolate was more extensive than the Episcopate, and the Primacy was over and above the Apostolate. It concerned not only the foundation of the Universal Church, but its preservation and its unity for all ages, and therefore it could never cease. St. Peter and his successors for evermore were constituted the Vicars of Christ. Not *Successors* of Christ, but *Vicars*. Christ still rules His Church, but he does so through the successors of Peter. The Apostles were associated with Peter in establishing and governing the Church, but they were subordinate to him as the representative of Christ.

The wall of the new Jerusalem in the Apocalypse 'had twelve foundations, and in them, the twelve names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb : ' and it was

Apostolic
privileges.
Apo. xxi. 14.

St. Matt. xix. 28. said to them by their Divine Master—‘ When the Son of man shall sit on the seat of His majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats judging the twelve tribes of Israel.’ These are Apostolic privileges in which they all are equal : and that Holy Church regards and venerates them still as her rulers in union with blessed Peter, is evident from the words of her liturgical Preface on their feasts, wherein she beseeches God that ‘ He the eternal Pastor will not desert His flock, but that through His blessed Apostles He will defend it with His continual protection. That it may be governed by the same rulers whom, as Vicars of Thy work, Thou hast employed as Pastors to preside over the same.’ St. Paul also tells us that we are ‘ built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.’

Missale Romanum. It is from his union with that corner stone that St. Peter is what he is. As, when on earth, our Lord associated him with Himself in the payment of the tribute, saying—‘ Take that, and give it to them for *me and thee*,’—so has He associated him with Himself as the rock on which the Church is built, the corner stone by which she is held together.

Eph. ii. 20. ‘ Other foundation,’ says the Apostle, ‘ no man can lay, but that which is laid ; which is Christ Jesus.’ Yet Jesus united Peter to Himself, and made him the visible minister of His own Divine work. Thus in the continuation of the sermon already quoted, St. Leo speaks as follows :—

St. Peter the foundation. ‘ I, Christ says, *say to thee*’ (Peter): ‘ that is, as my

St. Matt. xvii. 26.

I. Cor. iii. 11.

Ubi supra, p. 46. ‘ I, Christ says, *say to thee*’ (Peter): ‘ that is, as my

Father has manifested to thee my divinity, so I also make known to thee thy excellence. *That thou art Peter*: that is, though I am the inviolable rock; I, *the corner stone who make both one*; I, the foundation besides which no man can lay another;—yet thou also art the rock, because thou shalt be made firm by my strength, that those things which by my power are my own, may be thine in common, by participation with me.’

Elsewhere, the same holy Pontiff teaches:—

‘The Lord willed that the sacrament of this charge’ (preaching the gospel) ‘should appertain to the office of all the Apostles, with the understanding that He vested it principally in the most blessed Peter, the chief of all the Apostles; and He wills His gifts to flow into the whole body from the same, as from a head; that whoso should dare to withdraw from the solidity of Peter might understand that he has no part in the divine mystery. For He willed that this man, whom He had taken into the fellowship of an inseparable unity, should be named that which He Himself was, saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.*’

Epist. x.
ad
Episcopos
per
Provinc. Vienn.
constitutos.

Our Lord, indeed, is not only the foundation but the founder of His Church, which He has purchased with His most precious blood, and established upon Peter by His own power. All that Peter and others are, they are, not in their own strength, but in Christ’s. In this Christ necessarily stands alone, but He dispenses His gifts as He will and where He will. His word is power, and when He named Simon—the rock—He made him what he named him. When He promised to build on him the Church against which the gates of hell should not prevail, He bestowed on him an inalienable union with Himself for all time

Christ
is
all in all.

as the one foundation of that Church ; and, as that visible Church was to be gathered from successive generations of men, so, after Peter had followed his Lord both in His cross and in His glory, was it to be founded on the successors of Peter, imperishable and invincible in its basis and in its structure.

St. Peter
was made the
Head.

On them, also, was to descend the rule over the whole Church promised to St. Peter under the symbol of the keys, by which our Lord made him again to be a sharer in His own office. The keys are not promised to the Church, but to Peter. It is through Peter that they come to the Church ; through Peter that they continue with the Church ; and beyond the limits assigned by Peter and his successors their power is not extended.

Supreme authority
conveyed
by
the keys.
St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

Our Lord says, ‘ On this rock I will build My Church ; ’ and He adds, ‘ and I will give to *thee* the keys.’ He says not, *to her*, i.e. the Church ; He says, *to thee*—Peter—thereby setting him over the Church. For the keys convey more than the power of binding and loosing, which, in conjunction with St. Peter, was afterwards bestowed on the other Apostles ; they convey supreme authority over the exercise of that power. Thus, in the Apocalypse, our Lord speaks of Himself as having ‘ the keys of death and of hell ; ’ and again, as ‘ He that hath the key of David ; He that openeth, and no man shutteth ; shutteth, and no man openeth.’ The power of the keys *includes* both the power of binding and loosing, and also the control over the exercise of that power by others. When St. Peter’s

Apoc. i. 18.

Ibid. iii. 7.

keys open, none other can shut; when they shut, none other can open. It is not so with any other, for all others are subordinate to Peter. God says of Eliacim in the prophecy,—‘He shall be as a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Juda. And I will lay *the key* of the house of David upon his shoulder: and he shall open and none shall shut: and he shall shut, and none shall open.’ Primarily, this prefigured Christ; secondarily, His servant Peter. He made Peter His representative, as He had before chosen Eliacim to be His type.

Throughout the Gospels, the priority given to St. Peter is most apparent. In the lists of the Apostles his name is invariably first. Thus, in St. Matthew,—‘The first, Simon who is called Peter’—in the vulgate, *primus*—in the Greek, *πρῶτος*. So, too, we find frequently such expressions as—‘Simon and they that were with him.’—‘Peter and they that were with him.’ Again, when the women sought their risen Lord in the sepulchre, they were told by the angel,—‘Go, tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee.’ Why should Peter be especially named here, excepting as the leader and representative of the Apostles? St. Gregory the Great gives it, indeed, as a reason, that our Lord, in His loving tenderness, wished to encourage him after his fall and deep repentance. But, so far from ignoring the primacy, he goes on to explain why God permitted such a fall in the case of one

Isaias xxii. 21, 22.

St. Peter
named the first.

St. Matt. x. 2.

St. Mark i. 36.
St. Luke viii. 45;
ix. 32.

St. Mark xvi. 7.

whom he intended to set over the whole Church. He comments on the passage as follows :—

Hom. in Evang. xxi. 4. ‘ We must inquire why, when the disciples are mentioned, Peter is marked out by name. But, if the angel had not expressly named him who had denied his Master, he would not have dared to come among the disciples. Therefore he is called by name, lest he should despair on account of his denial. In which matter we must consider why Almighty God permitted him, whom He had determined to set over the entire church (*quem cunctæ Ecclesiæ præferre disposuerat*), to be affrighted at the voice of a servant girl, and to deny Himself. Which, in truth, we perceive to have been done by a most merciful dispensation ; in order that he who was the future Pastor of the Church should learn, through his own fault, how he ought to have compassion upon others. First, therefore, He shows him to himself, and then he set him over the rest, in order that he might learn, from his own infirmity, how mercifully he should bear with the infirmities of others.’

Why St. Peter
was
allowed to fall.

In this, too, was Peter to be made most like his Master, Who, though ‘ without sin,’ was ‘ tempted in all things like as we are,’ and can, therefore, ‘ have compassion on our infirmities.’

Heb. iv. 15.

Amongst early ecclesiastical writers the well-known designation of St. Peter is,—Prince of the Apostles. Thus (to quote one out of a multitude), St. Cyril of Jerusalem names him as ‘ Peter the chiefest (*ὁ κορυφαϊότατος καὶ πρωτοστάτης*) and foremost of the apostles ;’— ‘ Key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven.’ This chief position was continued to the See of Peter, as St. Augustine testifies when he speaks of ‘ the Roman Church in which the principality (*princi-*

Catech. ii. 19.

Ibid. xvii. 27.

Ep. xliii. 7.

patus) of the apostolic chair has always remained in vigour (*semper viguit*.)

It is the presence of Christ in His Church which renders her chief pastors collectively, firm and inviolable in the faith ; and this office also, which is exercised invisibly by His Spirit, He has conferred upon Peter and his successors as His visible organs. The words of our Lord are explicit. On the very night of His passion, when He prayed for the visible and perpetual unity of His Church, He gave to Peter alone the charge of confirming and consolidating that Church :—‘ And the Lord said : Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have *you* (*ὁμᾶς*) that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for *thee* (*περὶ σοῦ*) that *thy* (*σοῦ*) faith fail not : and *thou* (*σὺ*) being once converted, confirm thy brethren.’ The words vary,—*you*,—and *thee* and *thou*. All were to be attacked by hell ; but their strength was to be in one, and that very one who was afterwards to be their strength, was first to display his insufficiency apart from Christ ; that the power of Christ might, through all ages, be the more apparent in him through his previous momentary weakness when left to his own support. St. Ambrose, before St. Gregory, taught that the trial was permitted in order to fit St. Peter for his supreme office. He says :—

St. Peter's See
is also
the strength
of the
Episcopate.

St. Luke xxii. 31.

In Ps. xliii. 40.

‘ The adversary is compelled to tempt the Saints of the Lord, to his own loss. For by tempting them he makes them better, that he who is tempted may be able to instruct (*instituere*) others also ; even he who, to himself,

Reason
for
St. Peter's temptation.

appeared infirm. It is *then* that Peter is set over the Church, *after* he was tempted of the devil. And on that account the Lord signifies beforehand what that is, because, afterwards, he elected him Pastor of the Lord's flock. For to him he said : *but thou being converted confirm thy brethren.*'

The
good Shepherd.

Isaias xl. 11.

Our Lord is pre-eminently the good Shepherd. It is one of the most endearing of His titles, and the subject of one of the most touching of His prophecies respecting Himself :—' He shall feed His flock like a shepherd : He shall gather together the lambs with His arm, and shall take them up in His bosom, and He Himself shall carry them that are with young.' This office also, which, spiritually and invisibly, He Himself still fulfils, He has conferred upon Peter and the successors of Peter as His outward and visible agents and ministers. We know how, after the chief Apostle had redeemed his threefold fall by a threefold protestation of love, our blessed Lord Himself committed to him as His own Vicar, the charge of His own flock, by a thrice repeated commission,—' Feed my lambs,' ' Feed my lambs,' ' Feed my sheep,'—*Βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου, Ποίμεινε τὰ πρόβατά μου.* Feed and rule not only my lambs, but my sheep the mothers of the lambs,—my whole flock. Feed and govern all. The word *ποίμεινε* (which, in the Greek, has reference to the sheep) is the very same which is applied to our Lord Himself in the prophecy quoted by St. Matthew (chap. ii. 6), and rendered in the English, *rule* :—' that shall rule (*ποιμανεῖ*) my people Israel.'

St. John xxi

There is an account in the diary of Archbishop

Laud, of a conversation between himself and a Catholic on the primacy of St. Peter's See, and how at last the Catholic would make no other answer than the repetition of the words,—*Dabo claves,—Pascite agnos; Pasce oves.*—In truth, no human sophistry can elude the divine simplicity and force of our Lord's promise of supreme power, which was symbolized by the keys; nor explain away the fact of its completion and fulfilment in the final committal of the whole Church to the pastoral care and rule of Peter, which included the charge of confirming and maintaining in the faith his venerable brethren, the Episcopate of the whole world. Moreover it is manifest from the very nature of this commission, that it was to descend in its fulness upon each succeeding occupant of St. Peter's See, so long as there should be a flock to feed and to defend, to guide and to rule over.

It is not man, it is Christ Himself Who, in these His pastors, still holds the keys, and feeds and rules His flock. Thus, the Roman Catechism teaches of the Church, that 'its ruler and governor is one, Christ indeed invisibly, whom the Eternal Father "hath made Head over all the Church, which is His Body"; but visibly, the occupant of the Roman See, the legitimate successor of Peter Prince of the Apostles.'

'To Peter,' says St. Peter Chrysologus, 'does the Lord commend His sheep, when about to return to heaven, that he may feed them in His stead. . . . He commends to him the sheep and the offspring of the sheep; for He, the foreseeing Pastor, already knew

The office
promised and
conferred.

Christ
rules through the
Popes.

Catech. ex decreto
Concil. Trident.
p. i. cap. x.

Eph. i. 22, 23.

Serm. vi.
de
Jubil. ob Gent.
vocat.
circa A.D. 450.

Hom. in Vig.
SS. Pet. et Paul.¹

the future fecundity of His flock.' 'First,' says St. Eucherius (A.D. 445), 'He commits the lambs to him, then the sheep, because He makes him not pastor only, but pastor of pastors. Peter therefore feeds lambs and sheep, feeds children and mothers, rules both subjects and prelates.' St. Nilus observes that the Lord, after consoling the penitent heart of Peter, 'constituted him the shepherd of the whole world' (*ποιμένα τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης καθίστησιν*).

Lib. ii. Ep. 75.
circa A.D. 430.
Ed. Leon. Allat.

These offices
are
permanent.

It is self-evident that all these offices were not to cease with Peter, since they were not given for the sake of Peter, but for the sake of the Church, and for the work of the Church, and were still more needed for future generations than for the time when the other apostles were on earth. Numberless authorities might be produced to prove that such was the belief of the early ages; but it may suffice to quote two which distinctly state it. The first occurs in the address of the Presbyter Philip,

¹ Quoted from Sconce's *Testimony of Antiquity to the Supremacy of the Holy See*—a most useful book, published in Sydney, 1848, and sold by Messrs. Burns & Oates, of London. Besides authorities, it contains simple, clear, and honest reasoning. It is to be regretted that the Rev. J. Waterworth's *Faith of Catholics*, 3 vols. 8vo., Dolman, 1846, which gives so large and valuable a collection of early testimony to Catholic doctrine, has also reproduced certain propositions from a treatise censured by Bishop Milner as 'defective, ambiguous, suspicious, and erroneous.' See the Rev. W. H. Anderdon's letter in the *Weekly Register* of March 31st, 1866, republished by the *Dublin Review* in July 1866, p. 257, in reference to a reprint of the aforesaid treatise under the title of *The Catholic Eirenicon* (Hayes, London, 1865), 'from the edition of 1815.'

Legate of the Apostolic See of Rome, to the third great Ecumenical Council, held at Ephesus A.D. 431. There, in the heart of the East, without a dissentient voice among the bishops, he commences his confirmation of the condemnation of Nestorius (on the part of Pope St. Celestine) in the following terms:—

‘No one doubts, nay it is known through all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of the apostles, column of the faith, and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, and there was given to the same the power of loosing and of binding sins: who up to this time without intermission, and always, lives and exercises the office of a judge (*judicium exercet*) in his successors.’

Hard. Act. Concil.
T.I. col. 1478.

Anglicans profess to follow in all things the first centuries of the Church, and to accept the above-named Council of Ephesus. But, it may be asked, would the same words be received in the same way by the English convocation, if addressed to that assembly by a legate of Pope Pius IX. ?

It was not many years later when the great St. Leo (in one of his sermons on the anniversary of his elevation to the Roman Pontificate), after speaking of our Lord Jesus Christ as the great High Priest still ruling in His Church, continued his discourse as follows:—

‘Therefore, most dearly beloved, our festivity is not presumptuous, wherein, mindful of the divine favour, we do honour to the day on which we received the priesthood; inasmuch as we piously and truly confess that Christ fulfils

Serm. v. cap. iv.

the work of our ministry in all things that we rightly perform; and not in ourselves, who without Him can do nothing, but in Himself, Who is our power, do we glory. Another reason for our solemnity is not only the Apostolic, but also the Episcopal dignity of the most blessed Peter, who ceases not to preside over his see, and maintains an unfailing fellowship with the eternal Priest. For that solidity, which, from the Rock Christ, he also, made a Rock, received (*de Petra Christo etiam ipse Petra factus accepit*), has transfused itself also to his heirs, and wheresoever any firmness is manifested, without doubt there appears the fortitude of the pastor. For if, in order to show forth their merits, it has been granted to nearly all the martyrs everywhere, because of their endurance of the sufferings they embraced, to assist those in danger, to drive away diseases, to expel unclean spirits, and to cure innumerable sicknesses; who will so unskilfully or enviously estimate the glory of blessed Peter, as to believe that there are any parts of the Church which are not ruled by his solicitude and strengthened by his power?

De Trin.
L. vi. c. 20.

The graphic words of St. Hilary of Poitiers are as applicable now in the person of Pope Pius IX. as they have been heretofore through his long line of predecessors, and as they will continue to be to the end:—
‘Blessed Simon, after his confession of the mystery, supporting the edifice of the Church and receiving the keys of the heavenly kingdom.’—*‘Post sacramenti confessionem beatus Simon ædificationi Ecclesie subjacens et claves regni cœlestis accipiens.’*

The Primacy
is
a great grace.

I have but glanced at this vast and all-important subject, which lies at the very root of Christianity, and gives it an aspect under which a denial of the Pope’s supremacy in the Church becomes visibly ‘another gospel.’ Nor have I

done more than glean, here and there, one authority among thousands in proof of my assertions. Whole volumes might be filled, and have been filled, with the arguments and testimony of centuries, in support of this fundamental article of Christian belief. But, unless God prepare men's hearts, and unless men co-operate with God's grace, the most convincing of proofs will be unavailing. It is humbling to reflect that prejudice can have so great a power to close the human heart against the reception of a Christian truth so strongly and clearly attested, and, at the same time, so consoling, strengthening, and encouraging; so analogous to all we know of God's mercy and of His dealings, and so abounding in His love for us;—as is that truth of His ever-present rule and care, not only invisibly from the realms above, but visibly, tangibly, here on earth, in the venerable person of His own representative. Like all the other manifestations of His overflowing goodness, it is too great for human littleness; men can hardly rise to its conception; and unless His grace gives larger and more generous powers of appreciation and of confiding love, they cannot comprehend the vast munificence of His condescension. O truly 'slow of heart' are we, like the disciples on the way to Emmaus, 'to believe in all things which the prophets have spoken!' Christ's resurrection was to them a thought too glorious, too full of joy, to be true. Christ's perpetual presence with us through His Vicar may be, to many, a doctrine which so realizes

St. Luke xxiv. 25.

to the full all their visions of a Christian Church, that they think the happiness too great for earth, and accuse of sordid ambition that very See of Peter, in which Christ Himself presides through a human delegate.

Visible and present
testimony.

Nevertheless, not only sacred scripture and the holy fathers, not only venerable antiquity and all Christian history, proclaim this truth with the voices of ages that are past, and teach that out of the apostolical communion of Rome, no Church can be apostolic; but it is written with the finger of God in the passing events of the day and hour. Where else, save in the Roman Pontiff, is to be found the apostolic type at the present moment? Where else the image of God's tranquil power undisturbed by the rude confusions and wickedness of mankind? Patient, and meek, and tender, but strong with a superhuman strength. Forgiving, as Christ forgave; but testifying to truth and justice and everlasting right, as Christ also testified upon the cross. Here, in spirit and in letter, is beheld the apostolic pattern:—

2 Cor. vi. 3-10. 'Giving no offence to any man, that our ministry be not blamed: but in all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in tribulation, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in prisons, in seditions, in labours, in watchings, in fastings, in chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in sweetness, in the Holy Ghost, in charity unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God; by the armour of justice on the right hand and on the left, by

honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report : as deceivers, and yet true : as unknown, and yet known : as dying, and behold we live : as chastised, and not killed : as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing : as needy, yet enriching many : as having nothing, and possessing all things.’ The quotation may be continued, for the apostolic voice now responds to all who, remaining separated, still long for unity,—‘Our mouth is open to you, our heart is enlarged. You are not straitened in us : but in your own bowels you are straitened.’

Ibid. 11, 12.

Let thoughtful men compare, at this very moment, the world-wide labours and zeal ; the devotion and earnestness ; the faith, charity, and unity ; the spirit of self-sacrifice ; the chastity and heroic virtue ; the prevailing concord of bishops and priests among themselves, with Rome, and with the people ; so apparent among Christians in communion with the Apostolic See ;—let them compare these present facts, not with this or that individual instance which, from its nearness and its very singularity, assumes undue proportions, but with the general condition, and the usual religious standard of any other Christian body ; and let them say whether the Divine presence and the Apostolic rule of life are to be discerned in any other. That which amongst others is exceptional, if found at all, is set before Roman Catholics as their ordinary rule. Many, no doubt, fall short ; but many press on beyond it, and attain to heroic virtues not to be found elsewhere. Rome begins where

others end. The most advanced outside her, are but like tyros in her school of sanctity. Her very starting points for perfection are the evangelical counsels of continence, poverty, and obedience, virtues which she preaches on the housetops, and acknowledges as divine for all who are called to practise them. Whereas too commonly elsewhere, they must not be named unless in secret, and if practised at all it must be more or less by stealth. Far be it from me to withhold an earnest sympathy from all who anywhere may aim at them; far be it from me to make light of these or any other virtues wherever they may be found. I seek but to give them their perfection; to point out their true home, their natural birthplace, their congenial soil. To the established English Church they are exotic, foreign and unwelcomed by the mass. How many of her bishops are there who encourage the diffusion of these counsels of the Gospel, or who acknowledge them at all as such? Nay, to speak only of essential doctrine, her clergy are not agreed amongst themselves respecting many most fundamental truths of Christianity, such as our Lord's presence in the Holy Eucharist, the efficacy of Baptism, the existence of the Sacrament of Penance, and the like.

It is not hard to discern the one supernatural home on earth of all most true and most heroic in man's religious life. The only home of apostolic doctrine, and of apostolic virtues, is the Apostolic Church. Elsewhere, indeed, they may seem to be transplanted

and to flourish for a while, isolated and strange: elsewhere, too, may natural virtue be so highly cultivated as to seem, in human sight, to wear the aspect of divine; though not so in the eyes of God. But, at the best, such cases are the exception. In the Roman Catholic Church alone, is to be found the supernatural life of grace in that spontaneous and full development, which bespeaks its birthplace and its native air. It is there that, through its exuberance of growth; its full, vigorous, and prolific energy, recognised, welcomed, and familiar to all; its profusion of flower and prodigality of fruit; it reveals the divine fecundity of the soil, and gives evidence that its being and its strength are drawn from that exulting and abounding river, which gladdens the city and the vineyard of our God; which has its source in the pierced side and most precious wounds of Jesus, and flows on to us through the channel of the Apostolic chair of Peter.

God has given in charge to Peter the eternal interests of all mankind; and has constituted Peter's See the guardian of His gifts of grace. Rome alone dares claim this world-wide rule, and Rome alone possesses it. In her lives on, and ever will live on, the blessed rule of Peter. In her, through him, its head, the whole college of the Apostles is represented to us. Out of her communion no Church can be Apostolic. Christ Himself dwells in her, and He has established that imperishable dynasty as the everlasting basis of His everlasting Church. He has constituted

Rome
is
the centre of
unity.

each succeeding Roman Pontiff the teacher of His faith; the centre of His Church's Unity; the ruler and the shepherd of His flock; on him alone has He conferred the divine right of delegating His jurisdiction throughout the universe, and of sending forth the messengers of whom it is written:—*How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things!*

Rom. x. 15.

The Church
bears the image
of her
Lord.

This Apostolic mission is from Christ, and the model of it is His own mission from the Father. He, too, gives the Church her Unity, her Sanctity, her Catholicity. They are, all of them, the purchase of His most precious blood; the gifts of His most sacred Heart. They form the image and the expression of His own divine perfections, Who dwells Himself within her.

Apoc. v. 9, 10.

'Redemisti nos, Deus, in sanguine tuo ex omni tribu, et lingua, et populo, et natione, et fecisti nos Deo nostro regnum.'

II.

Quia non potest destrui, constat non esse divisum. Non enim dividitur unitas, nec scinditur; et ideo nec corruptelæ subditur, nec ætati.—*S. Ambros. de Fide*, lib. I. c. i. n. 11.

The Church's notes
must be
permanent
and
always visible.

THESE are the marks by which the Church of Christ may be known; these are her credentials. They are intimately connected with one another, and they are all of them essential; they cannot be divided, nor can any one of them be dispensed with. But if

they are notes they must be visible. When a person is described in a document it is by visible marks and features ; it would be mere trifling to draw his picture in lineaments which could not always be recognised. If the visible Church is to endure till the end of all things, it follows that every one of her notes must endure also, permanent as herself and equally visible and characteristic as at the beginning. It would be more consistent to deny the necessity of a visible church and visible sacraments altogether, than whilst affirming it, at the same time to profess that any one of the essential notes of that Church can ever be lost to sight. Those notes remain for all generations, and form collectively a token and a signal marking the abode upon earth of that God ' Who will have all men to be saved.' The mission of the Church, the very end of her existence, is the salvation of the whole human race, not of any privileged class alone ; and God cannot at any time allow her to be deprived of those marks by which she is always to be known through all the ages, to all who sincerely wish for salvation ; not only to such as have leisure and learning to turn over the pages of the Fathers, and laboriously investigate the teachings of antiquity, but to the poor, the ignorant, the labouring, the masses of the human race.

1 Tim. ii. 4.

Each one of the four notes of Christ's Church is affirmed as a matter of faith by the Creed, and no man can reasonably trust his soul to any communion which does not visibly possess them all.

Attractiveness
of
the theory
of the suspension
of
visible unity.

Consciences troubled by a sense of their separated position are naturally soothed and attracted by a theory which represents the existing divisions of Christendom in the light of a mere suspension of outward intercommunion, happening in chastisement for the sins of men, but involving no guilt of schism. There is a seeming humility in the teaching that separation ought therefore to be submitted to with resignation by individuals, though not without earnest prayers and endeavours for a general reconciliation. But this apparent angel of light is in reality a wolf in sheep's clothing, a delusive and seductive phantom, which will not stand the test of Ithuriel's bright spear of truth,—

Paradise Lost,
iv. 811.

' for no falsehood can endure
Touch of celestial temper, but returns
Of force to its own likeness.'

Divine
test of truth.

The Apostle 'whom Jesus loved,' has warned us against false spirits, and taught us how to detect them :—

I. St. John iv.
1, 2, 3.

' Dearly beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be of God : because many false prophets are gone out into the world. By this is the spirit of God known. Every spirit, which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God : and every spirit that dissolveth Jesus,¹ is not of God : and this is Antichrist, of whom you have heard that he cometh, and he is now already in the world.'

¹ Ancient codices quoted by Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 32, read:—ὁ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν; the Vulgate has :—*solvit Jesum.*—Note in Prof. Ornsby's edition of Card. Mai's Greek Testament. Dublin, 1860.

The meaning is the same in the Oxford Greek, which has:—ὁ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα.

The Church is at once the fruit, and the application, and the continuance on earth, of the Incarnation of the Son of God. Holy Scripture declares it to be, ‘His body, and the fulness of Him, who is filled all in all.’ Whatever doctrine, then, dissolves the Church, dissolves Christ’s presence upon earth. Whatever doctrine teaches that any one of the visible notes of the Church has failed, so far tends to deny that Christ is still with us in the Church.

Now, the theory in question asserts that the Church, through the sins of her members, has forfeited the gift of visible unity. This would resemble the judgment which fell upon the proud sons of men whose language was confounded at Babel. They were building a tower of pride to reach the heavens, and God at once frustrated their design by depriving them of outward unity. This one curse sufficed. We are not told that they were less one inwardly, less united in their evil hearts than before, but their speech was rendered diverse; they were scattered into all lands; they lost their outward unity, and they were impotent to build. God’s Church is God’s own tower, by which He bids the humble of heart ascend to highest heaven. Can it be true that He has turned her into Babylon in anger at her children’s sin, when it was sin she was sent to cure?

The test applied.

Eph. i. 23.

The theory tends to dissolve the Church’s notes: her Unity;

Her Sanctity ; The infliction of so severe a judgment would seem to imply an amount of wickedness incompatible with the Church's attribute of sanctity. Although her pale upon earth comprises sinners as well as saints, yet if sin can have so far prevailed within her as to have led to the suspension of her outward unity, it must also have obscured her visible note of holiness.

Her Catholicity ; If the Church's outward unity were thus suspended, and her inward energies crippled by prevailing sin, she could scarcely maintain her Catholicity throughout the regions of the earth, and certainly she would no longer be Catholic as to time. She would be a different Church from that of the early ages ; nor would they recognise her in her state of outward division and inward falling off.

Her Apostolicity. The Church's mission is from Christ and from the Holy Spirit, whose abiding presence Christ has promised shall be for ever with her,—‘the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive.’ Were it even possible that this blessed Spirit of Holiness could continue with the Church after her holiness was obscured by sin, yet His teaching would no longer be discernible amidst the disagreement of division. In fact, the maintainers of the theory of suspended unity hold that the infallible voice of the Church is suspended likewise, and that men must now seek it as best they can by ascertaining what it was that she taught at the time when she was visibly and wholly one. Yet they do not point to any authority which can declare or explain that teaching with divine certitude. So

St. John xiv. 16, 17.

that, according to this doctrine, the Church's mission as the infallible teacher of the nations is in abeyance also, and her note of Apostolicity has become as invisible as her other notes.

Thus does the aforesaid theory tend directly to dissolve the Church, Christ's body; it tends to a denial of the abiding constancy of the Fruit of the Incarnation amongst us in its fulness; it would rob us of our Emmanuel, our 'God with us,' of 'Christ come in the flesh.'—This, St. John warns us, is the mark of Antichrist.

Yet, as before observed, the same theory is so calculated to lull conscientious doubts regarding the safety of the Anglican position, that men who would abhor its consequences if perceived by them, have been beguiled into its acceptance and defence. Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon' is based upon it, and it is almost dogmatically put forth in the following extracts from a work by the Anglican Bishop of Brechin, Dr. Forbes.

After stating that unity is an 'attribute of the church,' and 'very clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures;' and asserting that 'the one truth requires one vehicle of its tradition, the society which was visibly to bear the image of the one Christ on earth,'—Dr. Forbes endeavours to show how real though unseen unity may still exist, beneath the divisions we behold.

'Unity,' he says, 'may be divided into objective and subjective. Objective unity is that inwrought by our Head, Jesus

Maintainers
of
this doctrine.

The
theory stated.
Explanation
of the
Nicene Creed,
by
A. H. Forbes, D.C.L.,
Bishop of Brechin.
pp. 274-7, 2nd edit.
London, Parker, 1866.

Himself, through union with Himself. It is wrought on His side, by the communication of the 'one Spirit,' and by the Sacraments, making us all one body in Him. It requires, on our part, continuity of the commission which He gave to His Apostles, and perseverance in the faith which He committed to the Church. Subjective unity is unity of will, and intercommunion with one another. Subjective unity may be suspended, while objective unity is maintained. Subjective unity was suspended during the schism at Antioch, yet objective unity is maintained, for the blessed Meletius is a saint. Subjective unity was suspended in the quarrels between the British and Western Churches in the Saxon times, yet nobody doubts of the salvation or sanctity of St. Aidan or St. Cuthbert. Subjective unity was suspended during the struggles of the antipopes, yet no one considers the followers of Peter de Luna as either heretics or schismatics. And this must also apply to the mighty dissension between the East and the West, and between ourselves and the rest of Christendom. It is deeply to be deplored that the state of the Church is as it is; but let us hope that the evil is not so great as it seems, and that there is a fund of unity, if men only understood each other; that the fissures are only surface ones; that the disorder is functional, not organic.'

Desire
for
better understanding.

Doubtless a better understanding would remove many hindrances to re-union. But it is mere self-delusion to conceal the fact that the divisions extend far below the surface. They have to do with points of dogma; with truths revealed by God to man, which admit indeed of explanation, but not of compromise. Still, 'if men only understood each other,' much more of common ground would be discovered than they are now aware of.

It follows then, as a necessary consequence, that every man should do what he can to understand, and to make himself understood; that no one should shrink from listening to, or from giving, full and patient explanation; that no one should rest on statements which have no foundation in fact, or persist in them when proved to be false; that none should dwell on hearsay rumours and idle tales with which our common enemy seeks to beguile men from the truth; it follows, too, that no opportunity for fair discussion, in a spirit of charity, should be withheld or avoided; that no consequences should be shrunk from, which God's truth may involve; that we all, in a word, should be true, generous, and loving, candid, open-hearted, simple, honest, and loyal, to God, to one another, and to ourselves. How far each one is so, is a question for each one to ask himself. Would to God we all made it our business to understand and to love each other better!

Dr. Forbes returns to the subject. At p. 285 he sketches the present divided state of Christendom, and asks,—‘What are we to say with regard to it? how are we to justify it?’ He rejects the doctrine that any single one of the various Christian bodies, whether Greek, Anglican, Roman Catholic, or any other, can be exclusively the one Church:—

‘What is this,’ he says, ‘but the spirit of Donatism? Can this really satisfy the enlightened conscience of the Chris-

Dr. Forbes's
examination
of
the subject.

Pp. 286-7.

tian? How, on this ground, shall we account for the evident good that exists beyond our own system? Shall the Roman Catholic gainsay the grace which has been poured out on the Greek Obedience, so that nations of heathens or of heretics have since the schism been gathered into the faith in Christ? Shall the Anglican believe, that the merits of Carlo Borromeo, the most perfect type of the Christian bishop which the world ever saw, are as the evidence of grace in a man accidentally better than his system? Shall either Greek or Roman speak of the devout Ken, or George Herbert, or Launcelot Andrewes, as devils' blinds to keep men by a simulated disguise of goodness from what they term the true Church? Nay, shall men undervalue the unsacramental grace of those, who like Spener and Gerhard have adorned systems, which, in their logical consequences, and generally in their practical results, have led to the most miserable consequences?

P. 287.

He equally rejects indifferentism, and the theory of an invisible Church, as 'incompatible with a real belief in the Incarnation of the Word, 'for,' he observes, 'that Word has been made manifest, has become visible, and therefore must energize in some definite visible body.' He adds: 'There are also distinct texts in Scripture which attach salvation to belonging to the One Body of Christ. There are certain outward conditions, such as Baptism, the Eucharist, common worship, and the like, which necessarily imply some visible body.'

Pp. 288-91.

He then proceeds:—

Dr. Forbes's explanation.

'The truth then must be somewhere between these two theories. On the one hand, we must avoid Donatism; on the other, Latitudinarianism. Holy Scripture sets forth

what Christians, as individuals, or collectively as the living Body of Christ, ought to be; but it does not say what degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the Gospel. The Church and her children in her were purchased by the blood of God, that they should be holy, the temple of the Holy Ghost, full of love and peace and all other fruits of the Spirit. It was said of individuals, "By this shall men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another;" as much as it was said of the whole Church, "That they may be one as We are." It was said of every Priest, "The lips of the Priest should keep knowledge," as much as it was said of the whole Church, "Thy teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more." Our Lord has promised, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;" yet surely as much by the Spirit of Holiness, as by wisdom and teaching. Since then our Lord's promise was fulfilled in that dreary and hateful tenth century, when it was said that although our Lord was in the boat, men were afraid to wake Him up, but rather wished that He might never awake to judge them; so may it be fulfilled now, although the fulness of His Presence may be abated through our divisions and want of love. We bear separate witness still to the One Faith which He gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds; we all look to Him, as truly present in His Sacraments, truly giving His own Body and Blood; we all hold to the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, teaching those same truths which they taught, and holding sacred the descent from them. We are one Body, through the one Spirit, and all partaking of the One Body of Christ, all holding to the One Head. The Body is mangled, but, we believe, not severed, through loss of intercommunion. We are one, we trust, in One, although in some, even grave things, not at one with one another. If the Gospel had its full course, every priest should be holy, and "all the children" of the Church "taught by God." Our Lord has promised, "I am with you alway, even to the end of

the world ;” but He has not promised to be always present in the same degree or the same way. He is not with us as He was with the Apostles, in that they were “full of the Holy Ghost,” and they spake as “moved by the Holy Ghost,” so that what they spake were the words of God, and have been, ever since, a fountain of truth to the Church of Christ, such as no words, since spoken through men, are or can be. He has been with the Church, in different degrees, since, according to her faithfulness. His Presence was lessened, surely, when He gave over whole Churches to the Moslem apostasy. His Presence was lessened when He had given a nation, once the glory of the Church, to set up the goddess of Reason. Everywhere He is present, in every office exercised in His name : He regenerates, He confirms, He absolves, He consecrates, He ordains, He preserves the truth, He teaches those who will receive it.’

I omit a paragraph on invincible ignorance, after which Dr. Forbes proceeds :—

P. 290.

‘It is best too to acknowledge our disjointed and unhappy condition, rather than to shape the Gospel into a theory that suits us. We had better acknowledge, that for the sins of Christendom subjective unity is suspended, and that while God has done great things for us, we have not co-operated therewith.’

He exhorts men to strive and pray for unity, and adds :—

P. 291.

‘One effect of our unhappy divisions is, that we cannot meet, even to heal them. Until we long more for unity, we cannot take even the first visible steps towards it, and union in heart must precede union in visible act. As God’s Holy Spirit fills the river of God, it will, in all its several channels, overflow its banks, until they meet in one vast sea of the knowledge and of the love of God.’

The river of God gladdens many nations, whose several hierarchies form many channels. But these hierarchies have all one visible head and centre, and thus the channels, though diverse, are not divided. Their life-bestowing waters flow on through the paradise of the one fold in many courses and directions, but they remain still visibly united with each other through their central union in the one spring which pours forth its abundant waves from the Apostolic throne; from the sacred hill of Sion, the holy mountain in which God dwells. These are the waters of 'the rivers of Juda, and their fountain comes forth of the house of the Lord,' which is established and built up by Himself on Peter. God owns not Churches of man's making.—'My people,' says the Lord, 'have done two evils. They have forsaken me, the fountain of living water, and have digged to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.'

It is true that 'the Spirit of the Lord hath filled the whole world:' that 'the Spirit breatheth where he will; and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he cometh and whither he goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' I have already spoken of the secret dealings of God with individuals. They are unfathomable. God has reserved them to Himself, and we cannot deduce from them any general rule of conduct. If we search into them, we seem to meet with the reply which Christ gave to His Apostle:—'What is it to thee? Follow thou me.' It is for each one to act up to his

One Church
in
many nations.

Joel iii. 18.

Jerem. ii. 13.

Wisdom i. 7.

St. John iii. 8.

See p. 17, &c.

The
mysteries
of
Divine grace.

St. John xxi. 22.

own knowledge, and to take heed to follow closely the light and grace vouchsafed to himself in particular. But of this we are sure ;—that the light and grace bestowed on those outside the fold, is intended by God to lead them onwards to full and outward communion with that one Church which is the one only visible temple of His presence ; the one only body of men wherein His Spirit everlastingly abides ; and, that, if they wilfully frustrate this divine purpose, they will be called upon to give account. Even Sacraments of the Church may be found outside her pale, wherever there is a true priesthood ; but they turn to death instead of life, to all who culpably remain in a state of schism.

Exclusiveness
of
the one Church.

The one Spirit of Christ animates the one Body of Christ, whose unity excludes all other bodies. It has many members, and its life-blood flows through many veins and arteries ; but they have all one only centre ; one heart which feeds them, and one circumference which limits them. No body of Christians can be external to this, and, at the same time, one with it. No Churches can be Christ's which are not visibly a portion of it. The sap which circulates through the vine gives life to that tree alone. It cannot nourish any other which is independent in its growth. The one living God cannot dwell in any Church but one : but that one Church is extended over the whole world, and God would have all men to unite themselves to her communion, and become partakers of her divine life.

It is in this sense that the Roman Catholic Church, though universal, is at the same time exclusive, and necessarily so. It is not her own doing, it is God's. Nor could she otherwise fulfil her office. Every one who believes in one visible Church and one definite revelation, and the necessity of faith in that revelation, must also admit the existence of certain limits. It is simply a question of degree; he must acknowledge a line of demarcation somewhere. Omnipotence itself cannot divide a unit, and still leave it one; nor elicit more than one truth out of innumerable discordant opinions. If the Church is one, by that very fact she becomes exclusive. If God has revealed the truth on any given point, by that very fact it becomes the only truth, as far as that point extends. Therefore, so far from exclusiveness affording any ground for objection, it is an essential characteristic of the one true Church. I do not say it is the only characteristic, or by any means a conclusive one, for a false system may assert it; but I say it is a necessary characteristic, for God's system can never admit a rival.

Here we find one of the many apparent paradoxes of Christianity, and, like all others, its solution is redundant in wisdom and beauty. There is no teaching which, whilst it strictly maintains the exclusive unity of God's religion and God's church, will be found, at the same time, one-half so free, so large, or so liberal, regarding the boundless, overflowing, and universal mercies of the self-same God, as the teaching of the church of Peter, out-

Solution
of the
seeming paradox.

side whose fold there is no salvation. There is no other teaching which can 'justify the ways of God to man,' maintaining to the full the claims of His truth and justice, and at the same time magnifying and extolling His sovereign prerogative of loving-kindness. Inside Christ's fold there are wolves who have no inward union with the flock; and, outside it, He may have sheep who belong to it in heart, and would run to its visible protection if they did but know it. How many such souls may there not be in the Russian and other Greek communions? And also amongst other separated communities? Yet, of late, in our own countries, the truth has been so loudly proclaimed, that there is too much reason to fear it is often rejected or put off.

The
Catholic
Doctrine.

The doctrine of the Roman Church is the only consistent or satisfactory explanation of the difficulty expressed by Dr. Forbes, respecting goodness found outside her, and it is a true and sufficient explanation. The following extracts will not be out of place from the pages of one more competent than I am to speak on such a subject. In his 'Lectures on Anglican Difficulties,'¹ Dr. Newman says:—

'Grace is given for the merits of Christ all over the earth; there is no corner, even of Paganism, where it is not present—present in each heart of man, in real sufficiency for his ultimate salvation. Not that the grace presented to each is such, as at once to bring him to heaven; but it is sufficient for a beginning. It is sufficient to enable him

¹ Burns & Co. 1850. Lect. III. pp. 70-74.

to plead for other grace, and that second grace is such as to impetrate a third grace; and thus the soul is led on from grace to grace, and from strength to strength, till at length it is, so to say, in very sight of heaven, if the gift of perseverance does but complete the work. Now, here observe, it is not certain that a soul which has the first grace will have the second; the grant of the second depends on its use of the first. Again, it may have the first and second, and yet not the third; or from the first on to the nineteenth, and not the twentieth. We mount up by steps towards God, and, alas! it is possible that a soul may be courageous and bear up for nineteen steps, and stop and faint at the twentieth. Nay, further than this—a soul may go forward till it arrives at the very grace of contrition, a contrition so loving, so sin-renouncing, as to bring it at once into a state of reconciliation, and clothe it in the vestment of justice; and yet it may yield to the further trials which beset it and fall away.

Now, all this may take place even outside the Church, and consider what at once follows from it. This follows in the first place, that men there may be, not Catholics, really obeying God and rewarded by Him, nay in His favour, with their sins forgiven and with a secret union with that heavenly kingdom to which they do not visibly belong, who are, through their subsequent failure, never to reach it. There may be those who are increasing in grace and knowledge, and approaching nearer to the Catholic Church every year, who are not in the Church and never will be. The highest gifts and graces are compatible with ultimate reprobation. As regards, then, the evidences of sanctity in members of the National Establishment, on which you insist, Catholics are not called on to deny them. We think such instances are few, nor so eminent as you are accustomed to fancy; but we do not wish to deny, nor have any difficulty in admitting, such facts as you have to adduce, whatever they be. We do not think it necessary to carp at every instance of supernatural excellence

among Protestants when it comes before us, or to explain it away; all we know is, that the grace given them is intended ultimately to bring them into the Church, and if it does not tend to do so, it will not ultimately profit them; but we as little deny its presence in their souls as Protestants themselves, and as the fact is no perplexity to us, it is no triumph to them.

‘And secondly, in like manner, whatever be the comfort or the strength attendant upon the use of the national ordinances in the case of this or that person, a Catholic may admit it without scruple, for it is no evidence to him in behalf of those ordinances themselves.’

He then explains the distinction between grace conveyed through a sacrament; as to an infant through baptism; and without a sacrament, through ‘the inward energetic act of the recipient.’ The

Session xiv. ch. 4.

Council of Trent refers to the case where ‘contrition is perfect through charity, and reconciles man with God, before the Sacrament of Penance is actually received.’ Thus, this disposition of the heart obtains the effects of that Sacrament without its actual

Ibid. ch. 2.

reception, although, as the same Council states, it ‘is as necessary for those who have fallen after baptism, as baptism itself for the unregenerate.’ The Council teaches, indeed, that, ‘the said reconciliation is not to be ascribed to that contrition, independently of the desire of the sacrament which is included therein.’ Still, if in such a case God gives the grace without the sacrament, He may do so also in other cases where men seek Him in good faith; especially, in ordinances where they think He is, though in truth He is not there. He visits them, in reward of their loving

search of Him, but it is not by the channel wherein they seek Him, and through which they think they find Him. Dr. Newman proceeds:—

‘Let me grant to you then, that the reception of your ordinances brings peace and joy to the soul; that it permanently influences or changes the character of the recipient. Let me grant, on the other hand, that their profanation, when men have been taught to believe in them, and in profaning are guilty of contempt of that God to whom they ascribe them, is attended by judgments; this properly shows nothing more than that, by a general law, lying, deceit, presumption, or hypocrisy are punished, and prayer, faith, contrition, rewarded. There is nothing to show that the effects would not have been precisely the same under the same inward dispositions, though another ordinance, a love-feast or a washing the feet, with no pretence to the name of a Sacrament, had in good faith been adopted. And it is obvious to any one that, for a member of the Establishment to bring himself to confession, especially some years back, required dispositions of a very special character, a special contrition and a special desire of the Sacrament, which, as far as we may judge by outward signs, were a special effect of grace, and would fittingly receive from God’s bounty a special reward, some further and higher grace, or even remission of sins. And again, when a member of the Establishment, surrounded by those who scoffed at the doctrine, accepted God’s word that He would make bread His Body, and honoured Him by accepting it, is it wonderful, is it not suitable to God’s mercy, if He reward such a special faith with a *quasi* sacramental grace, though he ignorantly offered to a material substance that adoration which He intended to pay to the present, but invisible, Lamb of God?’

Thus, Rome requires no one to brand as ‘devils’ blinds’ either Ken, or Herbert, or Andrewes, or any

Individual cases
afford
no criterion.

other. Nor yet men of another school, such as Henry Martin, Legh Richmond, Wilberforce, and, in our own day, the pious and meek Archbishop Sumner, whose goodness was notorious. Yet the same Dr. Sumner, on being consulted officially as Archbishop of Canterbury (after the Gorham decision), told the believers in baptismal regeneration to continue to teach that doctrine as heretofore; only to allow to those who differed, an equal freedom to deny it; just as the established English Church does now.

Presbyterians.

I am sure that, without referring to the Lutheran Gerhard, or to Spenser the father of Protestant German pietism, Dr. Forbes could have produced many striking instances of religious fervour from amongst the sectarians of his own land. There, in the open air on a summer Sunday, the traveller still may find the Gaelic preacher, and his crowds of listeners; children of those old Covenanters, who, firm to the death in their resistance to 'Antichrist and Prelacy,' met in multitudes to worship God on the barren mountain side. Of them came the young MacKail, who, according to Sir Walter Scott, displayed a martyr's courage under cruel torture, and welcomed the death to which, in the same cause, he was condemned, with the exclamation:—'I shall speak no more with earthly creatures, but shall enjoy the aspect of the ineffable Creator Himself. Farewell father, mother, friends—welcome glory—welcome eternal life—and welcome, death!'

Tales of
a
Grandfather.

Wesley
and
Whitefield.

What shall be said of John Wesley, with his boundless alms, his rice or biscuit food, his bed on

the floor, his constant toil and preaching, proving the sincerity of his prayer:—‘Lord let me not live useless’? There is Whitefield, again, with his early ardour in visiting hospitals and prisons, his spirit-moving sermons and his thousands of weeping hearers.

In spite of such phenomena, the question for each one remains the same. We have not to answer for others, excepting so far as we can influence them. We *have* to answer for ourselves.—‘What must *I* do, that I may be saved?’—Which is the Gospel of Christ?—Where is the faith once delivered to the Saints? For there is but one Gospel and one faith. If a very angel from heaven preach another, ‘let him be anathema!’ Thus are we warned by the Holy Ghost.

Cases of extraordinary goodness may be found even amongst the unbaptized. There is a well-known instance in the life-long, ceaseless, labours of the Quakeress, Mrs. Fry. Born to wealth, educated in accomplishments, at an early age she found herself, in mind, she tells us, as ‘a vessel without a pilot on a stormy sea,’ and she turned to scepticism; but she was brought back to religious convictions and a corresponding life by an American fellow-Quaker; and, even at the age of eighteen, she opened a school for eighty poor children, within her father’s house. After her marriage, the accounts of misery in the prisons reached her ears; she fearlessly entered the dungeons of Newgate, and found herself amongst 160 female prisoners and a number of children, in a den of depravity and

Personal
responsibility.

Quakers.

Mrs. Fry.

disorder. Her entrance raised a tumult, but her noble, loving mien and her gentle words controlled it. She returned a second time with her Bible, and pointed to it as the ground of her mission. She read to that wild assembly the 20th chapter of St. Matthew; how Christ calls all into His vineyard, how the last shall be first, how He came to give His life for all, and how He had compassion on the blind. She wearied not in her work, and at length the dungeon changed its aspect, and its inmates voluntarily undertook, at her suggestion, the observance of a formal rule as if their dwelling had been a convent. Thus commenced her life, and, ere it ended, it might be said of her that she had done for the moral character of prisons what Howard had previously effected for their material improvement. Her efforts were not confined to England; they extended to France, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and a part of Germany. The king of Prussia showed her especial honour. All the while, she was earnestly practising her religious tenets, and encouraging others in them. But up to the time of her death, she assisted and consoled the poor and distressed of all religions, and in her diary it was found, recorded by herself—‘I never feel so happy as when I have helped another by the way, or relieved the sufferings of some fellow-creature in affliction.’ She was honoured and beloved by high and low, and ‘her children rose up and called her blessed.’

Had not such a one the baptism of will? It may be so. It is God’s secret. But we know that God is just,

and very merciful. Not even a cup of cold water, if given for the love of Him, shall lose its sure reward.

God forbid we should ever deery goodness. God forbid we should ever shrink from extolling it as from Him, wherever it may be found. But heap together all the goodness, all the virtues, all the sanctity that exists, or ever has existed, throughout the globe, apart from the Church of Peter; and, not at its utmost, could the accumulation be compared with the heroic, eagle-soaring holiness, and transcendent unearthliness of life, which reveal the presence of the living God in the person of any single one of those superhuman miracles of His grace, who are to be found in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome, and whom she recognises as His Saints, shining in glory like the glittering stars of heaven.

My present purpose does not require me to analyse the accuracy of the statements of Dr. Forbes and others, respecting conversions effected by the Greek Church. I need not now pause to prove how mistaken is the idea entertained by some, that, in past ages, Russia received her Christianity from Constantinople at a period when that Church was severed from the Roman communion; and that Bulgaria owed it to the few schismatic priests who (together with other religionists mingled with them) so perplexed the Prince Bogoris as to induce him to address himself to Pope St. Nicholas I. Nor need I inquire whether more recent missionary efforts have surpassed the

Greek missions.

limits of Russian influence, even if they have extended beyond the bounds of her territory. Nor, again, how far their success may be due to the tempting Russian gold, or the formidable Russian knout,—to hopes or to fears for which Russia, not heaven, supplies the motive. We need not go beyond Catholic Poland to be convinced of her missionary ardour, or to learn the means which she hesitates not to employ in the propagation of a faith which is the handmaid to her politics. All this is beside the question; for though sterility is a clear mark of error (since God's spirit can never be inactive), yet fecundity is no sure mark of truth. On the contrary, heresy, sectarianism, and every other form of error, is usually more or less prolific. If, in any case, they can be pointed to as sterile, it forms the exception, not the rule. Mahometanism of old spread itself, like a withering blight, over the fairest regions of the East; and, in our own day, infidelity and irreligion have undermined, and, alas! still are undermining, the faith of thousands, in the most civilised countries of the West. Again,—the diffusion, the vitality, and the earnestness of the ancient heresies, and their widespread missionary work amongst the heathen, present an aspect perfectly astonishing, and form a mystery in our contemplation of God's dealings, which is unfathomable to the human understanding.

Nestorians,
Decline and Fall, &c.
chap. xlvii.

According to Gibbon, the Nestorian heretics successfully preached Christianity 'to the Bactrians,

the Huns, the Persians, the Indians, the Persarmenians, the Medes, and the Elanites: the barbaric churches, from the Gulf of Persia to the Caspian sea, were almost infinite; and their recent faith was conspicuous in the number and sanctity of their monks and martyrs. The pepper coast of Malabar and the isles of the ocean, Socotora and Ceylon, were peopled with an increasing number of Christians.' He says that, in a subsequent age, the Nestorian missionaries 'pursued without fear the steps of the roving Tartar, and insinuated themselves into the camps of the valleys of Imaus and the banks of the Selinga;' that they 'entered China by the port of Canton and the northern residence of Sigan;' and that 'under the reign of the caliphs, the Nestorian Church was diffused from China to Jerusalem and Cyprus; and their numbers, with those of the Jacobites, were computed to surpass the Greek and Latin communions' (at least in those countries).

Thomassin says that Marco Polo found many Nestorian Churches in Tartary, in the Mogul country, and in China and its capital, under a Patriarch whose residence was at Mosul on the Tigris, from whence, like another Pope, says the above-named author, he sent forth Archbishops and Bishops throughout the province of Babylon, and the whole of the Indies. He bore the title of the '*Catholicus*.' The Franciscan missionaries in the same (thirteenth) century, and at the commencement of the fourteenth, (as quoted by Fleury,) state, that they found the Nestorians still

Discip. de l'Église,
P. I. L. i. ch. xxiv. 7.

Ibid.
Livres lxxxiv. 19,
and xc. 46.

possessing a bishopric, and inhabiting fifteen towns, in China; degraded in morals and religion, but so powerful that they would not permit any Christian of a different rite to have an oratory there, however small, or to preach any other doctrine than their own; and the reason given for this is, that none of the Apostles or of their disciples ever came into those countries. In like manner, when the Portuguese began their expeditions to the East Indies, all the Bishops and Christians whom they found there were Nestorians, under the Babylonian Patriarch at Mosul.

Jacobites.

This primacy was however contested by the Jacobite Bishop in the same city, who ruled that rival heresy under the title of *Maphrian*, in subordination to the Patriarch of Antioch. This revival of Eutychianism spread itself over the whole of Asia and Africa, under the empire of the Saracens; and was said to have infected more than forty kingdoms with its pestilential tenets. It derived its appellation from the Syrian monk, Jacobus Baradaeus, by whose labours 'was revived, and united, and perpetuated the expiring faction' of the Monophysites. They had been befriended by the Emperor Anastasius, and their rule of faith had been defined by Severus, Patriarch of Antioch. But the succeeding Emperor re-established Catholicity in the East, and Severus fled into Egypt. Fifty-four bishops of his heresy were swept from their thrones, and eight hundred ecclesiastics cast into prison. It was from these prisoners, says the historian, that Jacobus Baradaeus

Thomassin
Discip. de l'Église,
P. 1. L. i. ch. xxiv. 2.

Gibbon,
ch. xlvii.

‘received the powers of Bishop of Edessa and Apostle of the East, and the ordination of fourscore thousand bishops, priests, and deacons, is derived from the same inexhaustible source.’ ‘The successors of Severus, while they lurked in convents or villages, while they sheltered their proscribed heads in the caverns of hermits or the tents of the Saracens, still asserted, as they now assert, their indefeasible right to the title, the rank, and the prerogatives of Patriarch of Antioch.’ He adds that ‘during five annual lents both the clergy and laity’ of the Jacobites ‘abstain not only from flesh and eggs, but even from the taste of wine, of oil, and of fish.’

All these things seem to be permitted as a scourge, and as a searching trial of men’s hearts—δοκιμασία πιστῶν—as St. Epiphanius says of the Arian troubles. From the very commencement of the world, the elect have been tested by counterfeit imitations of God’s truth; and so must it continue to the end, even till ‘that wicked one shall be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus shall kill with the spirit of His mouth; and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: him, whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying: that all may be judged who have not believed the truth, but have consented to iniquity.’

Probation
of
the faithful.

Advers. Hæres.
lxix. n. 12.

II. Thessalon. ii. 8-11.

Arianism.

How marvellous was the spread of the Arian heresy! For more than 300 years (nearly the age of modern Protestantism) it devastated the faith of thousands, and it has been resuscitated in modern Socinianism.

The Baptism
of
Valens.

The Imperial Russians, Olga and Wladimir I., received their baptism from Constantinople when that church was in communion with Rome; for the schism of Photius had, for the time, been healed. In the year 368, the Latin Emperor Valens was baptised, also, at Constantinople; but it was by Eudoxius, the Arch-Arian Bishop of that See, who, at the same time, imposed on the Emperor a solemn oath, never to renounce the Arian impiety, and to drive away all its opponents. He kept the vow too well.

Tillemont,
Hist. des Emp.
t. v. p. 89.

The Goths.

Through Valens the heresy was conveyed to the Goths. It spread through their various tribes, and envenomed them with so fierce a hatred of Catholics, that their cruelties rivalled those of the ancient Pagans. It was in one of these persecutions (A.D. 586) that the martyr St. Hermenegild, who had been converted from Arianism by his wife, met his death at the command of his own father, Leovigild, in consequence of his refusal to receive communion from an Arian prelate. Yet in some respects the virtues of these Arian Goths put to shame the evil lives of too many Catholics, whose immorality, Salviaan tells us, was such as to shock the very barbarians; and he asks of what use it is for such persons to reproach the Goths and Vandals with heresy,

De Gub. Dei, lib. vii.

whilst they themselves are ‘living in heretical depravity.’ Dr. Newman says that ‘the barbarians were chaste, temperate, just, and devout; the Visigoth Theodoric repaired every morning with his domestic officers to his chapel, where service was performed by the Arian priests.’ He adds that they are recorded to have sustained defeat upon a Sunday, owing to their being engaged in religious worship instead of preparing for battle; and that ‘many of their princes were men of great ability, as the two Theodorics, Euric, and Leovigild.’

Essay
on
Development,
p. 273.

The instrument employed by Valens for the original perversion of the Gothic tribes, was their own Bishop Ulphilas, a man of extraordinary gifts, and who had seemed a very Saint. He had exposed himself to an infinity of dangers for the conversion of these peoples; he had extended religion, civilized manners, invented letters, and translated the whole of the Bible into their language, except portions treating of war, which he omitted for fear lest the recital of the Jewish victories should inflame still more the too ready ardour of the Goths for the battle-field. Their veneration for him was unbounded; and when he yielded to the seductions of Valens and the Arian Bishops, he found it easy to persuade his flock that the points at issue were not essential. The heretical pest was spread from tribe to tribe, from multitudes to multitudes; and when they established themselves in the South of Europe and in Africa, their religion was a Christianity which denied

Ulphilas.
Tillemont,
Hist. Eccl. vi. p. 605,
&c.

the divinity of Christ, and sought to exterminate Catholicity. 'Behold,' observes Tillemont, 'how a single man drew down to hell this infinite number of the northerns. . . . It is a fearful example of that which the Truth Himself proclaims : that if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit. And St. Augustin had good reason so often to admonish both pastors and people, of the necessity of attaching themselves to Jesus Christ alone, and to the truth of His Gospel, and not to any man, whatever he may be, or however gifted by nature and by grace, since every man is a liar, prone to error, and even to fall utterly, like Ulphilas.'

Other heresies.

I might further cite the instances of Gnosticism and Novatianism in their day, as well as those of other heresies. In fact, after the most that can be made of Greeks and Russians, their efforts fall short of the usual activity of error, and it may be questioned whether their ardour equals that of the acknowledged heretics above named.

The early ages.

There are those who dream of the early centuries of the Church as of a golden age, when, if Christians had more to endure through outward fightings, they were less embarrassed by inward fears. Such persons picture to themselves the presence of Christ as being then more visible and tangible, and the unity of His Church as more apparent and undeniable. But these are pure imaginings. Those early days were full of perplexities and troubles; schisms and heresies were on every side; and perhaps there is no

period in Ecclesiastical history, in which the one only Church stands out more visibly and evidently than now.

I have already quoted Dr. Newman at some length on a point of doctrine. His testimony will not be considered less valuable respecting the history of those ancient times, which, it is well known, have formed a subject of his special studies. In his 'Essay on Development', he thus describes the state of the Church in the fourth century. I give his words with a slight abridgment:—'Few indeed,' he tells us, 'were the districts in the *orbis terrarum*, which did not then, as in the Ante-Nicene era, present a number of creeds and communions from which to select. In Egypt, in the earlier part of the fourth century, the Meletian schism numbered one-third as many Bishops as were contained in the whole Patriarchate.' (These were the followers of the Meletius condemned at the Council of Nice—a totally different person from St. Meletius of Antioch, who is referred to by Dr. Forbes.) 'In Africa, towards the end of the same century, the Donatists had 400 Bishops, the Catholics 466. Priscillianism was spread over Spain, and its author honoured as a martyr. At Rome and in Italy were found Manichees, Marcionites, and Origenists. Rome was moreover the seat of a Novatian, a Donatist, and a Luciferian bishop, in addition to the true Roman pontiff. The Luciferians were sprinkled over Christendom, from Spain to Palestine, and from Treves to Lybia. When St. Gregory Nazianzen

Fourth century.

Pages 243-245.

began to preach at Constantinople, the Arians were in possession of its hundred churches, and they had the populace in their favour. The Novatians, too, abounded there, and the Sabbatians had a church, where they prayed at the tomb of their founder. Apollinarians, Eunomians, and Semi-Arians, were there in great numbers. In the neighbouring provinces, popular feeling was with the Semi-Arian Bishops, who had possession of the coast of the Hellespont and Bithynia; and were found in Phrygia, Isauria, and the neighbouring parts of Asia Minor. Phrygia was the head-quarters of the Montanists, and was overrun by the Messalians, who had advanced thus far from Mesopotamia, spreading through Syria, Lycaonia, Pamphylia, and Cappadocia in their way. In the lesser Armenia the same heretics had penetrated into the monasteries. Phrygia too, and Paphlagonia, were the seat of the Novatians, who besides were in force at Nicæa and Nicomedia, were found in Alexandria, Africa, and Spain, and had a bishop even in Scythia. The whole tract of country from the Hellespont to Cilicia had nearly lapsed into Eunomianism, and the tract from Cilicia as far as Phœnicia to Apollinarianism. The disorders of the Church of Antioch are well known: an Arian succession, two orthodox claimants, and a bishop of the Apollinarians. Palestine abounded in Origenists, if at that time they may properly be called a sect; Palestine, Egypt, and Arabia were overrun with Marcionites; Osrhoëne was occupied by the followers

of Bardesanes and Harmonius, whose hymns so nearly took the place of national tunes that St. Ephrem found no better way of resisting the heresy than setting them to fresh words. Theodoret in Comagene speaks in the next century of reclaiming eight villages of Marcionites, one of Eunomians, and one of Arians.

‘These sects were of very various character. Learning, eloquence, and talent were the characteristics of the Apollinarians, Manichees, and Pelagians; Tichonius the Donatist was distinguished in biblical interpretation; the Semi-Arian and Apollinarian leaders were men of grave and correct behaviour; the Novatians had sided with the orthodox during the Arian persecution; the Montanists and Messalians addressed themselves to an almost heathen population; the atrocious fanaticism of the Priscillianists, the fury of the Arian women of Alexandria and Constantinople, and the savage cruelty of the Circumcellions, can hardly be exaggerated. They had their orders of clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons; their readers and ministers; their celebrants and altars; their hymns and litanies. They preached to the crowds in public, and their meeting-houses bore the semblance of churches. They had their sacristies and cemeteries; their farms; their professors and doctors; their schools. Miracles were ascribed to the Arian Theophilus, to the Luciferian Gregory of Elvira, to a Macedonian in Cyzicus, and to the Donatists in Africa.’

Such is Dr. Newman's account of the false Christs and false Churches of the fourth century. In the same volume he concludes his picture of the fifth and sixth centuries with the following summary :—

Fifth and sixth
centuries.

Ibid.
Pages 314–317.

‘Dreary and waste was the condition of the Church, and forlorn her prospects, at the period which we have been reviewing. After the brief triumph which attended the conversion of Constantine, trouble and trial had returned upon her. Her imperial protectors were failing in power or in faith. Strange forms of evil were rising in the distance, and were throning for the conflict. There was but one spot in the whole of Christendom, one voice in the whole Episcopate, to which the faithful turned in hope in that miserable day. In the year 493, in the Pontificate of Gelasius, the whole of the East was in the hands of traitors to Chalcedon, and the whole of the West under the tyranny of the open enemies of Nicæa. Italy was the prey of robbers; mercenary bands had overrun its territory, and barbarians were seizing on its farms and settling in its villas. The peasants were thinned by famine and pestilence; Tuscany might be even said, as Gelasius words it, to contain scarcely a single inhabitant. Odoacer was sinking before Theodoric, and the Pope was changing one Arian master for another. And as if one heresy were not enough, Pelagianism was spreading with the connivance of the Bishops in the territory of Picenum. In the north of the dismembered empire, the Britons had first been infected by Pelagianism, and now were dispossessed by the heathen Saxons. The Armoricans still preserved a witness of Catholicism in the west of Gaul; but Picardy, Champagne, and the neighbouring provinces, where some remnant of its supremacy had been found, had lately submitted to the yet heathen Clovis. The Arian kingdoms of Burgundy in France, and of the Visigoths in Aquitaine and Spain, oppressed a zealous and Catholic clergy. Africa was in a still more deplorable condition under the cruel sway of the Vandal Gundamond: the

people indeed uncorrupted by the heresy, but their clergy in exile and their worship suspended.

While such was the state of the Latins, what had happened in the East? Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, had secretly taken part against the Council of Chalcedon and was under Papal excommunication. Nearly all the whole East had sided with Acacius, and a schism had begun between East and West, which lasted for thirty-five years. The Henoticon was in force, and at the Imperial command had been signed by all the Patriarchs and Bishops throughout the Eastern empire. In Armenia the Churches were ripening for the pure Eutychianism which they adopted in the following century; and in Egypt the Acephali had already broken off from the Monophysite Patriarch, were extending in the east and west of the country, and preferred the loss of the Episcopal Succession to the reception of the Council of Chalcedon. And while Monophysites or their favourers occupied the Churches of the Eastern empire, Nestorianism was making progress in the territories beyond it. Barsumas had filled the See of Nisibis, Theodore was read in the schools of Persia, and the successive Catholic¹ of Seleucia had abolished Monachism and were secularising the clergy.

If, then, there is now a form of Christianity such, that it extends throughout the world, though with varying measures of prominence or prosperity in separate places;—that it lies under the power of sovereigns and magistrates, in different ways alien to its faith;—that flourishing nations and great empires, professing or tolerating the Christian name, lie over against it as antagonists;—that schools of philosophy and learning are supporting theories, and following out conclusions, hostile to it, and establishing an exegetical system subversive of its Scriptures;—that it has lost whole Churches by schism, and is now opposed by powerful communions once part of itself;—that it has been altogether or almost driven from some countries;—that in others its line of teachers is overlaid, its flocks oppressed,

¹ The title of the Nestorian Patriarchs.

its churches occupied, its property held by what may be called a duplicate succession ;—that in others its members are degenerate and corrupt, and surpassed in conscientiousness and in virtue, as in gifts of intellect, by the very heretics whom it condemns ;—that heresies are rife, and bishops negligent within its own pale ;—and that amid its disorders and fears there is but one Voice for whose decisions its people wait with trust, one Name and one See to which they look with hope, and that name Peter, and that see Rome ;—such a religion is not unlike the Christianity of the fifth and sixth centuries.’

Trials
of
the Church.

Thus did the great Searcher of Hearts then try the souls and spirits of His people ; and the one sure star He sent to guide them was the Rome which guides us now. I give the statements as I find them. The comparison was drawn from outside the Church, although its author was then close upon her threshold ; but the more unfavourable the view, the stronger becomes the argument. ‘It is impossible,’ said our Lord, ‘that scandals should not come,’ and we cannot lay claim to a present immunity from them. Still, though the Church has unsound members, her pale is free from heresies, nor can her existing hierarchy be charged with negligence. Her children, in general, are unsurpassed, in virtue at any rate, by any other. But, alas ! there are exceptions. In a country pre-eminently Catholic, and by men who call themselves Catholic, the Roman Pontiff has been despoiled of large tracts of territory, and his exhortations, nay, even his very excommunications, have been disregarded and set at nought. Catholic hands have sacrilegiously laid hold of property which is conse-

St. Luke xvii. 1.

Existing scandals
in
Italy.

crated to the Most High God, and have impiously and barbarously turned adrift on the wide world, thousands of holy men and of religious women from out of the hallowed precincts of the cloister; precincts now perchance resounding with the ribald jest and the profane song, where so lately there went up the voice of prayer and sacred psalmody, of intercession for sinful man and of canticles to God's praise.

Nor are these the only scandals which now afflict the Church. She has to mourn over other unfaithful children, and even over some who were once looked up to as the teachers and the guides of the people, but who have fallen away and taken part in 'the contradiction of Core;' 'wandering stars;' 'murmurers, full of complaints.' 'These are they who separate themselves, sensual men, having not the Spirit.'

Defections
of
eminent men.

St. Jude.
Ep. v. 11. 13. 16. 19.

Such trials ever have been, are, and will be a portion of the Church's warfare on this earth.

The period previously described is precisely that which Anglicans regard as the Christian age of gold. It forms a portion of those happy halcyon days, during which they admit the outward visible unity of the Church of God, and unhesitatingly reject, as heretics and schismatics, all whom that Church rejected as such. It has been seen how the Christians of those ages were divided and rent asunder by disunions and divisions as great as there exist around us now. But nowhere throughout that period is there discernible among Catholics, the remotest trace of the acceptance of such a theory as that on which Anglicans are now tempted to repose in false security. It was

The Church's
Golden Age.

reserved for a later age to dream that a divinely appointed note of the Church might be hidden for a while, eclipsed and lost to sight, withdrawn by God in His displeasure at the wickedness of man:—that her outward unity might be suspended, and mankind reduced to the hope that, inwardly and invisibly, it might in some way still subsist. On the contrary, those ancient days abound in testimonies to the necessity of the visible, tangible, unity of the one Church, outward as well as inward, and to the hopelessness of salvation apart from her one fold.

Communion
with Rome.

Neither can it be denied that the universal body of Christians which Anglicans themselves acknowledge to have formed, at that time, the one only Church, were always in outward communion with the Roman Pontiff. Passing differences or misapprehensions, might indeed occasionally give rise to an interruption of cordiality ; and there were times of coldness between the East and the West ; but early antiquity does not afford one single instance of an entire, systematic, and permanent suspension of outward communion with Rome, excepting in the case of those whom Anglicans themselves denounce as cut off from the body of the faithful. History renders it evident beyond a doubt, that, in those dark days of doubts and fears and perplexities, the one rallying point of Catholics, the general standard round which they gathered, was—Rome ; the test of their faith was—communion with the Roman See.

Ancient appellation
of
'Roman.'

There are even instances which prove that in Arian times, as now, the actual appellation of *Roman*

was distinctively applied to Catholics, denoting approbation or reproach, as the case might be. Thus, in his *sacra*, addressed to the Berrhœan Bishop Acacius, and others, at the time of the Council of Ephesus, the Emperor Theodosius speaks of ‘approved priests of the *Roman* religion.’ Ruinart, in a note to his edition of St. Gregory of Tours, refers to an Arian Council at Toledo, which gave directions respecting the reception of persons ‘from the *Roman* religion’ into their party. St. Gregory of Tours himself says, distinctly,—‘they are in the habit of calling (*vocitant*) men of our religion, *Romans*.’ Du Cange quotes an instance from the writings of Lucifer of Cagliari, as follows:—‘We *Romans* say that He’ (the Son) ‘is of one substance with the Father.’ He refers also to Victor Vitensis, and a life of St. Eligius, to the same effect.

Harl. Conc.
t. 1, col. 1687.

Hist. Franc.
col. 248.

De Gloria Mart.
col. 748, ed. Ruin.

Glossar. sub vocem
Romanus.

It is said of Samson, in the Book of Judges, that ‘he killed many more at his death, than he had killed before in his life.’ The tenth century was bad enough whilst it lasted, but since it has gone, it has formed a perfect storehouse for weapons against the Church—a repertory for scandalous histories, by which others besides Dr. Forbes have too often been led astray. Cardinal Baronius himself was deceived by them. Its evils cannot be denied, but they have been allowed to obscure the recollection of the good, which atoned for them so amply, which fought with them, and won the day.

‘The
Tenth Century.
See
the remark
of
Dr. Forbes,
above, p. 73.

Rome was then a prey to factions and base

Rome in
the
Tenth Century.

intrigues. The tiara itself was at the bestowal of the worldly and unworthy, and the power of God alone could have supported and preserved the Church's centre, under a trial so severe. It is most worthy of note, and a visible sign of the Divine protection, that, with all the enormities charged on the lives of certain Popes of that age, not one public or official act of any of them was derogatory to the sanctity of St. Peter's chair. As regards their private characters, it is not investigation, but the shallow credulity of prejudice, which they mostly have to fear. So much as a century ago, the learned Muratori pointed out how little reliance can be placed on the scandalous histories fished out from defamatory libels and romances, and recorded by the partisan Liutprand; from whose writings they have been repeated and multiplied by more recent authors. In particular, he vindicates the characters of those much-abused Popes, Sergius III., and John X.

Annali
d' Italia.

Sergius III.

The chronicle of Frodoard (who lived nearer to the time than Liutprand) describes the whole world as rejoicing at the election and reign of Sergius. He rebuilt the Lateran Basilica when all others despaired of it, 'flying for help,' says John the Deacon, 'to the divine mercy in which he always confided.' His epitaph records his love for his flock, and his resistance against invaders of holy things.

John X.

John X. formed the league which decisively repulsed the Saracens, the terror of the south of Italy at that time; and the panegyrist of Berengarius describes him as a Pontiff 'eminently illustrious in his

office, and full of wisdom.' After a reign of fourteen years, he ended his life in prison, where he was confined by Guy and Marozia, whose usurpations he had resisted. The story ran that he was smothered. Frodoard hesitates not to say that his soul escaped quickly to the throne decreed for him in heaven.

'Munificisque sacram decorans ornatibus aulam,
Pace nitet dum, Patricia deceptus iniqua,
Carcere conjicitur, claustrisque arctatur opacis.
Spiritus at sævis retineri non valet antris;
Emicat immo æthra decreta sedilia scandens.'

Frodoardus
de
Roman. Pontif.
Muratori, an. 928.

It was the same century which (himself unwilling) saw the elevation to the Popedom of the pious Leo VII. History depicts him as a man of prayer and meditation, of large views and conciliatory manners, and he has left fifteen epistles, still extant, which testify to his piety, zeal, and learning. Marinus II., during the three years of his pontificate, strove earnestly to amend the ignorance of his times; and he had a worthy successor in Agapitus II., who reigned ten years. Other Popes there were in that age whose virtues were conspicuous. If so be (perhaps through deficiency or partiality of evidence) that the good fame of any is still obscured, we can but adore, with Card. Bellarmine, the inscrutable wisdom of God, which has permitted 'the gates of hell' to do their worst, whether by open violence or insidious snares of wickedness, in order that the world may perceive and own the impotence of Satan against the Church; and may acknowledge that the rock of Peter, on which it is built, is inviolable and impregnable,

Leo VII.
and
other Popes.

Migne,
Patrol. Lat.

Prefat. in lib.
de
Summ. Pont.
§ 8.

because sustained by Almighty strength, and one with the everlasting rock,—with the Christ Who cannot fail.

Holiness
always visible.

The Divine Spirit of Holiness is always present with God's Church, and visibly so. But Holiness may vary in the degrees of its manifestation, to an extent which Unity, from its very nature, never can do. The line of demarcation between unity and schism is evident and well defined, though men may be more or less near to it on either side. There are seasons when the Church's holiness shines out with an unusual lustre, and others when it is not so dazzling in its bright effulgence. Still that light is never hidden. There is no age of the Christian era which will afford any ground for the parallel apparently implied by Dr. Forbes,—that Holiness was hidden then, and that Unity may be hidden now: or for his theory,—that the external manifestation of either one or the other may be suspended, through a lessening of Christ's presence.

I do not deny that the tenth century was an age in which 'iniquity abounded, and many hearts grew cold' in love. But I maintain that heroic grace abounded also, and that numberless hearts then burnt with a charity whose flames burnt on in their successors, and have never since become extinct. It was a period of fierce struggle; sloth and worldliness invaded the sanctuary, and doubtless many wished that Christ should sleep. But it was not so, by any means, with all, nor was the wickedness consented to, or unresisted. In this hour of need the Church's

holiness was displayed by the efforts of a multitude of her children against the evil; and our Lord's presence was made manifest through His inspirations, which led earnest and faithful hearts to arouse Him by their cries. In that tenth century, prayers were put up, and deeds were done, and seeds were sown, whose result and produce, alone, may testify that their origin was from heaven, and that their sowing (albeit in tears) was in no barren or unblest soil. The Church must have succumbed had it not been for her intrinsic and divine holiness; which, so far from being obscured, shines out more bright and visible, from her trial and her triumph. Even the vehement contemporary denunciations both of councils and of individuals, while they reveal to us the evil, at the same time make manifest by their existence that it was neither triumphant nor universal. Holiness was all the while active throughout the Church—inwardly in the hearts of her children; outwardly and visibly in their works; and audibly in their denunciations of the abounding wickedness.

With all its drawbacks, this same tenth century witnessed the conversion to Christianity, of the Normans, Muscovites, Swedes, Poles, Hungarians, and other peoples. Harold, king of the Danes, demanded a miracle from the Christian priest Poppo, who was preaching to him the divinity of Christ. The man of God, in reply, held in his naked hand a red-hot iron, yet was not burned. The king embraced the faith, and Denmark received a Christian

Evidences
of
Holiness
in the
Tenth Century.
Darras. Hist. Gén.
de
l'Église.

hierarchy. The rudeness of the age was redeemed by many similar acts of heroic virtue.

The tenth century had its popular errors, but it cannot be accused of having given birth to one single heresy. It was not wanting in piety, as may be gathered from the mention found in its chronicles, of the practice (even among royal personages) of assisting at the nocturnal religious offices. On one occasion, the same page of history affords a revolting example of the barbarity of the times in the assassination of the Emperor Berengarius. Not dreaming of danger, he had chosen to pass the night in a small room from which he could easily reach the church, rather than in his palace which might have been defended. He had refused to have any guard; and he rose, as was his wont, for the public prayers, at the call of the midnight matins bell. He was met on his way by a band of conspirators, and foully murdered near the church's door.

These contrasts form a special character of the age. Its scandals were grievous, but they were atoned for by numerous examples of surpassing brightness.

The tenth century can boast of the holy Empress Saint Mathilda, foundress of so many nunneries, and mother to the Emperor Otho. His wife was St. Adelaide, and his brother was St. Bruno, the great Archbishop of Cologne. In England there reigned King Edgar the Peaceable, great in the power of his sway when rowed up the river Dee to the Church of St. John the Baptist, by eight

Muratori, Annali,
A.D. 924.

Saints
of the
Tenth Century.

other kings, his vassals; but greater still in his humility, when, in obedience to Holy Church, he expiated a heinous crime by a seven years' public penance. He was succeeded by his son, the pure and holy Edward, enrolled as a Saint in the Church's calendar; and popularly styled a martyr also, through the love and veneration which his subjects bore him. Nor must St. Edith be forgotten, half-sister to St. Edward, who, when he was treacherously slain in the year 978, refused to quit her cloister, though invited to claim the throne. During this age, Venice beheld two of her doges (one of them was St. Peter Urseoli) put off their ducal robes and caps, and hide themselves under the cowl and tonsure of the cloister. At Constantinople, the century opened with the passage to a higher throne of the sainted Empress Theophania; the year 925 was marked by the decease of the Patriarch St. Nicholas, of the same city; and his place, but three years later, was filled by St. Tryphone. When the tenth age closed on Hungary, it left her king, St. Stephen, busied in rooting out idolatry from amongst his people; whilst he was cultivating in his own heart all Christian virtues and self-denial. In the same century were born and nursed up St. Henry II., the German emperor, and St. Cunegund, his spouse,—angelic examples of virginity in holy wedlock. It was the age of St. Adalbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg; and of his namesake, St. Adalbert, Bishop of Prague, called the Apostle of the Prussians; in whose country he

Butler,
Sept. 1 .

was honoured with a martyr's crown. St. Ulric of Augsburg; St. Wolfgang; our own St. Dunstan, and St. Oswald the Bishop; the Scotch St. Cadroe; the Irish St. Cormac, Bishop of Cashel and King of Munster; were amongst the many who adorned it. The virtues of St. Radbod, who governed the diocese of Utrecht, rivalled those of the primitive Bishops, and he was 'excessive,' says Butler, 'in his charity to the poor.'

In Greece, St. Nicon (called, from his constant cry, the *Μετανοσι̅τε̅*, or *Do Penance*), after converting the Armenians from prevalent errors, was evangelizing Crete, (which had lately been rescued from the yoke of the Saracens,) and working wonders in the Peloponnese.

Spain and Portugal had their St. Gennadius and others; they had St. Rudisind the Bishop, and his sister the Abbess, St. Senorina, to whom her holy brother's decease was revealed by angelic voices chanting the *Te Deum*, whilst she was at Compline with her nuns.

In Calabria was found St. Nilus the younger. It was he whom the Emperor Otho visited, where he dwelt amongst his monks who lived around him in poor scattered huts. The Emperor offered lands and endowments, and bade the holy Abbot to ask what favour he most desired. St. Nilus would accept nothing of this world, but he did not refuse to solicit a favour of another kind. 'All that I ask of you,' he said, 'is to save your own soul; for, though Emperor, you must die and give an account to God.'

Lives of the Saints.

Nov. 29.

St. Nicon
the
Metanoite.

Baronius,
an. 961, &c.

Bollandists,

May 25.

March 1.

April 22.

St. Nilus

Butler,

Sept. 26

In the north of Italy, Bishop Atto of Vercelli, after the example of many others, was loud in his denunciation of the abuses of the age.

There, too, under the holy hermit Marinus, the great St. Romuald was commencing that austere but loving life of heroic sanctity and contemplation, which bore such abundant fruit both in his own and future generations. Multitudes were moved by him to repentance; whilst he went about, as if a seraph in divine love, inflaming all who heard him speak. In the Vatican gallery there hangs a painting—a masterpiece of Andrea Sacchi—which represents the vision, wherein St. Romuald saw a ladder like to Jacob's, 'standing upon the earth, and the top thereof touching heaven'; whilst on it there went up a white-robed long procession of his children in Jesus Christ, an ascending train of holy monks from the order which he founded, and which derived its title from their monastery at Campo Maldoli, the two words being contracted to Camaldoli. It was situated in a large and retired valley, the gift of a rich lord, named Maldoli, whose memory has been thus happily perpetuated in connection with that wonderful religious foundation, wherein lives on to our own day the spirit of their first holy Abbot—St. Romuald—offspring of the tenth century.

It was in the same age that the young Bernard, of the château of Menthon in Savoy, son of a powerful baron, fled (like a second St. Alexis) from a sumptuous banquet at his father's house, on the eve

Atto
of
Vercelli.

St. Romuald
and
Camaldoli.

Batler,
Feb. 7.

The Hospice
of
St. Bernard.

Bollandists. Act. SS.
15 Jun.

of the espousals destined for him, and when his father was on the point of surrendering to him the barony. They sought him in the morning, and he was gone; but a writing met their eyes, which said:—‘O sweetest parents, I beg of you, rejoice. My King and Saviour is my guide; seek me no more, nor spend on me your care. I wish not to marry; I wish not to reign on earth; I wish to reach high heaven.’ In obedience to a celestial vision, he made his way to the Archdeacon of Aosta. In after years he succeeded to the office; and it was then that, inspired with charity for the wayfaring, and with zeal for God’s glory, he either founded or restored, amidst the Alpine snows and barren rocks, the two hospices through which his name has since been given to the passes of the Great and Little St. Bernard. The former was previously called the Hill of Jupiter; and the legend tells of a huge infernal statue, or idol, on its summit, the dread of all travellers, which the holy Bernard in the might of God destroyed. In the same strength he rooted out from those regions the still lingering remains of the heathen worship of Jupiter. He was styled the ‘Apostle of the Alps,’ and he was equally active and successful in his missionary work in Lombardy. He undertook a journey to Rome, to obtain the Pontifical approbation of the rules for his monastic institutions on the Alps, which he placed under the protection of his sure and never-deserted patron, St. Nicholas. Those institutions have borne their

fruits. The glow of their divine charity, unchilled amidst the surrounding ice and snow, has ever since been renowned and venerated throughout the world. St. Bernard of Menthon died in a good old age, 'full of days' and full of holiness—of days each one of which was full; full of loving piety to his God, and of loving service to his neighbour.

At that period the Abbey of St. Gall, in Switzerland, was celebrated for the learning, and eminent for the piety and sanctity of its monks. In the early part of the century, under the direction of the Abbot, there abode in a small and neighbouring cell the recluse St. Wiborada: the blessed Rachel was her disciple. The year 976 was marked by the death of the holy Bishop, St. Conrad, who, for forty-two years, had ruled the diocese of Constance with unwearied watchfulness and zeal. Saint Gebherd soon afterwards became its Bishop.

In the time of the above-named St. Conrad was founded the great Abbey of Einsiedeln, whose church is said to have been consecrated by angelic or Divine hands. It was built over the cell of St. Meinrad, where, in the preceding century, that holy hermit had sanctified his soul, and met his death at the hands of assassins. St. Conrad has himself recorded, that, during the night of September 14th, 948, which preceded his intended consecration of the church, mysterious and marvellous voices reached his ears; and in the morning, when, after long hesitation, he was at length about to commence the

Switzerland.
Abbey of
St. Gall.

St. Conrad.
Butler,
Nov. 26.

Einsiedeln.

ceremony, he was prevented by these words :—‘ Stay, brother ! God Himself has consecrated this chapel.’

St. Ludmilla.
St. Wenceslas.
Brev. Roman.
Sept. 28.

In Bohemia it was the age of St. Ludmilla and St. Wenceslas, both of them of sovereign rank, and martyrs. It was by love that the Duke St. Wenceslas ruled his subjects, and it was love for God and man which ruled supreme in his own breast. He would rise by night in secret, and carry heavy burdens of wood for fuel to the doors of the needy ; he was a father to the orphan, a friend to the friendless and the captive, a consoler and helper of all in distress. He bound himself by a vow of celibacy to a life of angelic purity, and it is said that angels were seen in attendance on him on more than one occasion. He would go about to the churches by night, in the snow and ice, with naked and bleeding feet, leaving behind him their prints, which warmed the frozen earth (*sanguinea et terram calefacientia post se relinquens vestigia*). It was in the year 938, at midnight, in or near a church to which, as usual, his devotion conducted him, that he was slaughtered by his own brother, at the instigation of their unnatural and pagan mother, Drahomira. It was by the hands of her assassins, also, that his grandmother, St. Ludmilla, who brought him up, had previously been strangled.

Gandersheim.
Roswitha.

In that part of Lower Saxony, now called Brunswick, the Convent of Gandersheim was exhaling the sweet odour of sanctity all through this evil age. Founded in the latter half of the ninth century by Duke Liutolf and his wife Oda, and ruled succes-

sively by three of their own daughters, its nuns were conspicuous for their monastic discipline, and assiduous study of the Holy Scriptures. Here dwelt the pious Roswitha, the reputed authoress of a series of Christian melodrames, which she composed, says the preface attributed to her, in anxiety that the talent with which she was entrusted should not be eaten away by the rust of neglect, but rather that it should resound with the Divine praise, under the constant mallet of devotion. *Sedulo malleo devotionis percussum divinæ laudationis referret tinnitum.*

The authenticity of these poems has recently been called in question, but no doubt has been raised respecting the sanctity of the convent of Gandersheim during the period before us.

At the very opening of the tenth century, the virtues of Berno, the holy Abbot of Baume, attracted the notice of Duke William of Aquitaine, who solicited from him the foundation of a new monastery within his own domain, on whatever site he should select. It is said that the abbot fixed on the spot then occupied by the Duke's kennels. 'You need only,' said the man of God, 'turn out the hounds, and let in the monks.' The Duke assented; and thus, in the year 909, was founded that great Abbey of Cluny, nursery of Saints, and parent of numerous offshoots. Its first abbot, the blessed Berno, governed seven religious houses. At his death he was succeeded by the great St. Odo, who was three times summoned to Rome by the Popes, to reconcile

Cluny
and its
Abbots.

differences amongst princes, and to effect conventual reforms. It was he who gave the caution to his monks never to close their doors to the blind, the sick, or the beggar, 'for these,' said he, 'will be the doorkeepers of the kingdom of heaven.' He was a lover of silence, which he called 'the father of holy thoughts and of great deeds.' 'Peace and charity,' he was wont to say, 'dwell in a community where silence reigns.' He died in the year 942, and was succeeded by St. Aymard. St. Mayeul followed in 965. He laboured with success in reforming and restoring various monastic houses in Italy. The Pontifical throne was offered to him, but he excused himself as unfitted. He died A.D. 994. His successor was St. Odilo, one of the first promoters of the great truce of God, that merciful alleviation to the miseries of the time. Thus, all through the tenth century, the spirit of sanctity was predominant amidst the holy monks of Cluny; and, after a brief period, there issued forth from the same cloisters, as another giant to run his course, the great reformer Hildebrand, the high-minded St. Gregory VII., strong in truth and justice, and in the power and grace of God.

Hidden Saints.

Such are a few of the prominent marks of holiness which adorned the tenth century, and made manifest the active presence and assistance of the God of holiness, in His one true Church ruled over by the Roman Pontiff. The catalogue is incomplete, yet it is so long as to appear a digression. More might be added from history; and, besides this,

how much there must be that remains hidden to us! The name of each Saint enrolled in the Church's calendar, implies a host of hidden Saints, who are only known in heaven. It implies an antecedent sanctity from which the flame was caught; it implies sanctity in those around who helped to nurse it; it implies both contemporary and prospective sanctity in the many whom that holy man instructed in the love of God—in all who, by his precepts and example, were helped to save their souls, whether in his lifetime or after his decease. The same must be said of every monastery which is founded—of every good work which stands recorded. Such acts are never single or isolated, in their origin or their existence. They neither spring from nothingness, nor do they subsist on nothingness, nor do they vanish into nothingness. Each deed of grace whose memory has survived to us involves many others, which, though lost to time, are treasured for eternity, an unknown multitude, to be revealed at the day of judgment.

I affirm, then, that during the tenth century, as in all others, the Roman Catholic, the one only, Church, was not merely the fosterer, the refuge, and the home of supernatural holiness; its protector and its preserver; not merely was she the dispenser of the means of holiness; the appointed guardian and keeper of its divinely constituted channels; but over and above all this, the Spirit of holiness shone manifestly and brightly both within her and all around her—she was visibly, and plainly, and distinctly, holy; then, as now,

and as always; holy in her works; holy in her loving patience; holy in her exhortations; holy in the lives of her true children; holy in the supernatural and heroic grace of the many Saints who, like shining lights, never ceased to illuminate the gross darkness of that period, and who protested by their words and deeds against its many and crying iniquities. And ere the tenth century passed away, it gave birth to a very phoenix of divine and burning love, who arose as it were from its ashes, the great and holy St. Peter Damian (born about the year 988), the precursor of St. Gregory VII.; the denouncer of abuses, and reviver of interior discipline, who, during the age which followed, like another St. John Baptist, prepared the way for those wonderful reformations which so happily characterised its close. Severe in life; ardent in temperament, which he subdued and converted into holy zeal; a lover of solitude, charity, and humility; there are few names more distinguished in the Church's annals, and more eminent amongst her mediæval Saints, than his whose official signature is appended to a Papal Bull, preserved at Monte Cassino, as—' *Peter the sinner, Bishop of Ostia.*'

St. Peter
Damian.

Men
may fall away,
but
Christ's presence
is not
lessened.

It is impossible that any one note of the Church can ever become invisible. There may be certain periods in her history which seem more clouded or more bright than others; seasons when her Lord appears to sleep, as well as others when He arises to assuage the tempest. But, whether sleeping or

waking, He is always there; there, in ‘the fulness of His presence,’ which is never ‘lessened,’ never ‘abated;’ never hidden, or eclipsed.

The Mahometan impiety of old, and the more recent blasphemies of infidelity, are no such signs as Dr. Forbes supposes,—of a lessening of Christ’s presence with His one universal Church. Long ages previous, whole hosts of angels were ‘given over to’ the fires of hell, yet God’s presence was not lessened in those courts from which they were expelled.—‘There was a great battle in heaven, Michael and his angels fought with the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels: and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And that great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, who is called the devil and satan, who seduceth the whole world: and he was cast unto the earth, and his angels were thrown down with him.’—Here is the very type, the root, the origin, the source, of all schism and of all pride. Had heaven sinned, that its unity was thus impaired?

P. 74, above.

Apocalypse,
xii. 7-9.

‘Angels are bright still, though the brightest fell.’

What strange theory is this? Does the gospel suit it, or it the gospel? When Jesus taught the great mystery of the holy Eucharist, and ‘many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him,’ was His blessed presence lessened with the faithful remnant of whom He asked—‘Will you also go away?’ Was it lessened with the chosen twelve, though He then declared that one of them was ‘a

St. John, ch. vi.

Ibid. vv. 67, 68, 71.

devil' ? And when that very one betrayed Him to the cross, and when others fled and left Him, was He less with His Church then, at the moment that He died for her ?

Were there no schisms and heresies in the apostolic age which followed, and to which Dr. Forbes himself appeals as a time of the fulness of Christ's presence ? Hear the beloved Apostle—' As you have heard that Antichrist cometh ; even now there are become many Antichrists : whereby we know that it is the last hour : They went out from us ; but they were not of us.' Again, St. Jude,—' These are they, who separate themselves, sensual men, having not the Spirit.' And St. Paul speaks of it as a necessity,—
 1 St. John ii. 18, 19. ' There must be also heresies : that they also, who are reprov'd, may be made manifest among you.'

Ep. ver. 19.

1 Cor. xi. 19.

Our Lord never said that the vigour of the sap of His one true vine should be abated, because of the fruitless branches He cut off. When He threatened the individual churches in the Apocalypse with severance from the body, He never told His faithful that the body itself should have less share in the out-pouring and the indwelling of His Holy Spirit.

Nor when the early heresies sprang up was that gracious presence lessened. Nay, the worse the assaults of Satan, the nearer to us is our God. ' Where wert thou, Lord,' asked St. Catherine of Siena, ' when my soul was flooded and overwhelmed with foul imaginings and evil thoughts ? ' ' In the midst of thee,' was the reply, ' to preserve thee from

perdition.’ So is it with the Church. God never will suspend her living, acting, visible, unity, whether subjective or objective, or of any kind whatever. Her unity is Divine, and this embraces all unities. This admits of no abatements or lessenings, no severings or distinguishings, no splittings or philosophizings. She is One, as God is One.

If the Church’s visible unity could ever be suspended, it must have been so in those troublous days of the fourth century, of which I have already spoken. Contemporary authorities, both from West and East, describe their miserable dissensions in the most vivid colours. St. Hilary of Poitiers addresses the Emperor Constantius in language well calculated to convey an idea of their confusion.

Visible Unity
never
suspended.

He tells him :—

‘We are in a condition most dangerous and deplorable; for now there exist as many faiths as inclinations, as many doctrines as fashions, and there spring up as many causes of blasphemies as there are vices. . . .

Ad Constantium
Lib. ii. 4, 5, 6.

‘Whilst men fight in words, question about novelties, dispute about ambiguities, complain about authors, strive about pursuits, whilst there is difficulty in agreement, and one begins to be anathema to the other: hardly any one now is Christ’s. For we fluctuate with the uncertain wind of doctrines: if we teach, we disturb; if we are taught, we go astray. . . . Every year, nay every month, we decree new faiths respecting God; when decreed we repent of them, we defend the repentant, and we anathematise the defended; either in our own we condemn what belongs to others, or in others we condemn what is our own; and biting one another, we are now consumed of one another.

‘Then men seek for faith as if they possessed it not.

They require it to be written, as if it was not in their hearts. We, who are regenerated through faith, are now taught respecting faith, as if our regeneration were without it.'

Further, he designates, as among the chief causes of their miseries, two evils, which are characteristic of the present age also—viz. that men 'avoid believing concerning the Lord Christ those things which He taught were to be believed about Him;' and that 'under the specious name of peace they steal into a unity which betrays the faith.' '*Per speciosum pacis nomen in unitate perfidiæ subrepiamus.*'

In the East there arose a corresponding cry from St. Gregory Nazianzen:—

Orat. ii. 81.

'All things have become again as at the first, before the world was, whilst as yet it was devoid of the form and comely order we now behold; but the chaotic and disordered mass required the form-bestowing hand and power. Or, if you will, we are like men in a nocturnal combat, who, under the faint rays of the moon, know not friends from foes; or, as if in a naval fight and stormy sea, stunned, and perplexed, and deprived of an opportunity for manly deeds by the blows of the winds, and the seething surge, and the onrush of the waves, and the clashing of the ships, and the thrusts of the poles, and the calls of the commanders, and the groans of the falling—alas, what grief! we fall foul of one another, and are destroyed by one another.'

Such is the testimony borne by two holy Bishops and Doctors, then living, to the state of the Christian world in the fourth century; ere yet Anglicans would consider Christ's presence to have 'lessened.' It prepares us for the account given by a Pagan historian of

the same age, who states that owing to their dissensions, the Emperor Julian 'found there were no wild beasts so dangerous to men as most of the Christians were destructive to themselves.' '*Nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum, expertus.*'

Ammianus
Marcellinus,
Lib. xxii. 5.

Yet, when we contemplate those times from the vantage ground of what was then a futurity of fifteen centuries, we perceive, distinct and evident through the mixed medley of contending parties, the clear outlines of the one church; the comely form of the one spouse; the well-fenced and visible fold of the one shepherd; in which alone were to be found the waters of eternal life, and outside of which no wanderer could be Christ's. So will it be, in ages yet to come, when generations now unborn look back upon our present age. So is it now with the holy angels, and with all those blessed ones who are looking down upon us from the heavenly realms of peace.

There is a strange fallacy which runs through Dr. Forbes's argument, and which arises from his not distinguishing between divine promises and precepts to individual Christians or to individual churches, and those which are addressed to the universal Church of Christ. An individual Christian, though 'purchased by the blood of God that he should be holy,' may forfeit his high heritage and defile 'the temple of the Holy Ghost,' casting away the priceless gifts of 'love and peace and all other fruits of the Spirit.' He may

Distinction
between
Individuals
and
The Church.

See extract,
above, p. 73.

sin against the distinguishing mark of Christ's disciple, that of love to all the brethren. Christ gave it as a mark of His true followers, but He never promised that each of them should always keep it. Whereas it has been already shown, that, in a way which pledged God's word in perpetuity, 'it was said of the whole Church, "That they may be one as We are."'

See above,
pp. 7-14.

Again—surely no reasonable man would gather from the prophecy or assertion that, 'the priest's lips should keep knowledge,' that every priest was infallible, but rather that such was the appointed and ordinary channel through which the people were to learn the knowledge of God. Whereas the declaration that the Church's 'teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more,' is manifestly a prophecy which includes a solemn promise.

The children
of
The Church
are
taught by God.
See the extract,
above, p. 73.

Dr. Forbes observes also that, 'if the gospel had its full course, every priest should be holy, and "all the children" of the Church "taught by God."' Now, there are few, if any, more striking proofs of the indwelling presence of God within the Roman Catholic Church, than the large, and ample, and literal fulfilment within her, of the promise of divine teaching and guidance for every individual soul who does not wilfully turn away from it. It is fulfilled outwardly and inwardly, collectively and individually. The living voice of God is heard in ways most manifold, through the organ of the Church His living temple, 'the teacher from God,' who speaks with God's authority.

Through the Church's creeds, her dogmatic decrees, her sermons, her catechisms, her offices, her practices, her devotions, and the like, her children are, all of them, 'taught by God.' Again, each one is 'taught by God' in that wonderful sacrament of surpassing, superhuman mercy and condescension, the blessed sacrament of penance, wherein the poor sinner pours out his burdened heart to the minister of his God and Saviour; or rather, through the ear of that minister to the tender, yearning heart of that God and Saviour Himself, of Jesus Who is there to enlighten His servant, and to pardon through His servant's lips. It is there that the penitent unfolds the trials and temptations of his Christian warfare; and not only does the cleansing blood of Jesus wash away his stains, but through the self-same minister the voice of God is heard; guiding and directing; consoling or warning; encouraging; and, if sometimes threatening, ever loving, ever merciful. Thus, through the outward ear, is each one 'taught by God,' and led on his own particular path to heaven; and he is not only taught it, but he is enabled to follow it, through the grace which the sacrament conveys.

But there is another teaching still, and who shall unfold its mysteries? God's inward voices to the faithful Christian soul are far beyond all human words, or human thoughts. The removal of every obstacle to the hearing, or the understanding, or the obeying of these heavenly whispers; the interpretation of the divine will thus manifested in secret;

Outward teaching.

Inward teaching.

counsel to promote and to assist each one, in the most simple, childlike, and full co-operation with the light and grace thus lovingly vouchsafed;—these are the objects of the sublime office of the direction of souls, which is divinely entrusted to the duly qualified amongst the Church's ministers, through whom God teaches the humble of heart, and preserves His cherished flock from being led astray by the delusions of their own imaginations, or by false spirits which are not from Him. Thus He assists His chosen people to follow His leadings, and to correspond to the calls and the workings of His grace.

All
are not
obedient.

Most truly and most fully, then, are all the Church's children 'taught by God.' But it is nowhere promised that all shall listen or obey. We are warned by our Lord Himself to expect the contrary. He has taught us expressly that His Church on earth contains both the just and the wicked, and will always do so till the last. Nor are His priests exempted from this rule. They are called, it is true, to an especial holiness, and their office is always holy, but there is no more promise of holiness to them individually, than there is to any other. Like others, they may fall short of their vocation, and prove unworthy of their sacred office; and, as if to forewarn us to be prepared for such scandals, we find a Judas even amongst the apostles selected by our blessed Lord in person.

St. Matthew, ch. xiii.

The Church exists
for
the salvation

'My thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the hea-

vens are exalted above the earth, so are my ways exalted above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts. And as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return no more thither, but soak the earth, and water it, and make it to spring, and give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater : so shall my word be, which shall go forth from my mouth : it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please, and shall prosper in the things for which I sent it.' The Church is for man, not man for the Church ; and the word of God which called it into being 'shall prosper in the things for which He sent it.' The Church is God's ambassador, charged with His commission to preach the gospel to the whole world, so long as time endures, and to convey the means of grace to every soul that is athirst for the heavenly streams of life. God's word is pledged that His gospel shall never fail, therefore that word guarantees to us that the Church, to whom the gospel has been entrusted by Him, will never forfeit or be deprived of any, be it even the least, of all those endowments and prerogatives that are needed for the end for which He sent her. Had God Himself not pledged His word, we might have feared lest the sins of man should prove too much for His amazing patience, and lest 'the blessings of the gospel' should become forfeited. But His thoughts are not our thoughts, nor our ways His ways. The deeper the abyss of our misery, the fuller becomes the abyss of His mercy. His word shall not return to him void :

like the fruitful rain that soaks into the earth, it shall prosper in the things for which He sent it. The Church collectively, as teacher of the nations and stewardess of the sacraments, is not on her probation ; though all her members are, priests as well as people, from the supreme Pontiff on the chair of Peter, down to the little child just washed in the baptismal font. The Church collectively, has an end for which she exists ; and so has each one of her members, individually. Her children are here to save their souls, and to reach the everlasting enjoyment of their God in heaven, by knowing, and loving, and serving Him faithfully in this life. This is the season of their probation, and, if they fail, their end is lost for ever. The Church is here to assist them in their trial, to help them on their way, to conduct them to their God, Who is their end and their beginning. For this she exists and is on earth. The failure of the Church in aught requisite for this, would be the failure of God Himself, who constituted her for this very purpose. It would be the failure of His Word to the universal race of man.

God's promises
to the
Church
are
absolute
and
unconditional.

Hence, no analogy whatever can be drawn between God's promises to individuals, and His promises to the universal Church. The former are dependent and conditional, unless they affect the universal interests. The latter are absolute and unconditional, because they cannot be separated from the universal interests. Thus, there is no promise that an individual priest shall not be a wicked man ; and, if he

is so, his judgment may be more severe than that of others. But it is a great Catholic truth—to adopt the language of the Anglican 26th Article—that ‘the unworthiness of the ministers hinders not the effect of the sacraments;’ . . . ‘which be effectual,’ as it further says, ‘because of Christ’s institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.’ The sacraments were instituted for the universal good, and no amount of individual evil can lessen their *intrinsic* virtue. If the recipient is in evil dispositions it will prevent their efficacy in his own case, and may even turn the blessing into condemnation; but the fulness of the sacraments themselves will in nowise be impaired, nor Christ’s presence in them lessened. So is it with the Church. Outwardly as well as inwardly, she is always holy, though comprising a mixed multitude; and though, so long as the world shall endure, she will contain both the wicked and the good. Outwardly as well as inwardly, she is always one; though many have fallen away, and have gone out from her, who were not of her. Always,—whatever may be the accumulation and the heinousness of human wickedness—always in the midst of her, in the fulness of the Divine Presence, is Christ our God, and His ever-abiding Spirit. He has sent her forth to overcome the universal evil, and, therefore, the stronger that evil waxes, the more securely may she rely on the persevering constancy of His assistance, from Whom alone she derives her strength, and in Whom alone she lives.

1 St. John ii. 19.

Distinction
between ordinary
and
extraordinary gifts.

See above, p. 74.

Acts vi. 5.

There are doubtless times when the grace of God is more largely and manifestly poured out than at others,—occasions when it may be said to overflow. It is not that it is ever lessened, for it is always present in superabundance; but it is that there are seasons of its miraculous manifestation; or, to speak more exactly, when it becomes more manifestly miraculous, for a miracle it always is. Dr. Forbes seems to have overlooked this consideration, when he says that Christ ‘is not with us as He was with the Apostles, in that they were “full of the Holy Ghost.” Doubtless, the Apostles had extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, all of which were not handed down to their successors. Such gifts may have been independent of their apostolic office; or else not required for the Church’s mission in the ages which were to follow. But ‘the fulness of God’s presence’ does not always bring these gifts. We are nowhere told that they were communicated to St. Stephen, yet he is described, in express terms, as ‘full of faith, and of the Holy Ghost.’ Now, unity is not one of these extraordinary gifts. It is an unceasing mark of the Church, and declared to be so in the Creed of the Apostles. It belongs, therefore, to her essence, it is necessary to her, and can never be withdrawn. It distinguishes her from others; therefore it never can be hidden. Its continuance and its visibility are requisite for her Gospel Mission; therefore they have their place among the ‘faithful mercies of David,’ guaranteed to us by the eternal Truth.

This, then, is the answer to Dr. Forbes’s observa-

tion that, though our Lord has promised to be always with us, 'He has not promised to be always present in the same degree or the same way.' The comment is true as regards the extraordinary effusions of God's grace, or manifestations of His power. It is not true of all that is essential, or, in any needful way, auxiliary, to the life or the mission of His Church. Therefore, it is not true of visible unity, which forms one of her constituent parts and features, which is one of her dearest and most cherished prerogatives; necessary for the fulfilment of her mission; a note that she is God's messenger, and a characteristic of God's message.

Christ's presence
never varies
in
essentials.
See extract,
above, pp. 73, 74.

The promise was made by Christ at the same St. Matt. xxviii. 20.
solemn moment that He sent forth His Church to teach and to baptize all nations, and to instruct them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded her. Therefore it manifestly implies no variation of His assisting presence in anything which may be required for the fulfilment of that commission. But it not only implies this, it expresses it, by the word—'always,'—or, as more literally in the Douay version,—'all days.'—In the Greek it is *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας*. The words are too plain to admit of any doubt.—*Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*—It is not only—*I will be* with you, it is the unchangeable—*I am*—that is to say:—as now, so for ever; and that, 'in the same degree and the same way,' as regards all that is required for the fulfilment of the commission

then conferred. Every day, and in all the days, whatever they may be ; in evil days, and in good days ; in days of persecution, and in days of triumph ; in days when wickedness is found in the highest places (as in Judas, among the Apostles), and in days when Priest and Pontiff excel alike in virtue, as in office ; in days when the Church is mourning through the iniquity of faithless children (though iniquity never shall prevail), and in days when she is the admiration of the whole earth, resplendent with grace, and conspicuous for sanctity. The promise is absolute and unconditional, that is, if it requires any conditions for its fulfilment, it includes a guarantee that they shall not be wanting.

God pledges His word to man. He strives to raise man's fainting courage for the accomplishment of His great ends of mercy, in which He makes him His co-operator. Why, then, should men, poor faithless worms of earth, explain God's blessed promise all away? God says,—‘I am with you all your days.’ Alas! shall man reply,—‘True, Lord; but you do not say you are always present in the same degree or the same way?’ Should we not do wrong to a fellow-mortal if we thus questioned his generosity? We cannot trust too fully to the word of the eternal God. We cannot interpret it too largely, in such a case as this. He is not one to mislead us with artificial language—

To palter with us in a double sense ;
To keep the word of promise to our ear,
And break it to our hope.

I repeat, that I am not speaking of those especial manifestations of His presence which, in His loving wisdom, He vouchsafes or withholds as befits the times and seasons, but of all that which appertains to the constitution and essence of the Church, as is the case with visible unity; of all that is requisite for her mission, to which visible unity is indispensable; and of all that belongs to her characteristic Notes, of which Unity is one; and it could not be a Note at all if it were not visible.

Every word of the promise is remarkable. It is particularly to be observed that the expression—*I am with you*, on the part of God,—has a special force, wherever it is found throughout the pages of Holy Scripture. It invariably conveys an assurance of success by means of unfailling and extraordinary divine assistance. On the other hand, the expression—I am *not* with you—is used in the reverse sense. This has been exemplified by Professor Murray in a list of texts which fill several pages, and from which I select a very few.

Thus, God says to Isaac,—‘Do not fear, for *I am with thee*’—and to Jacob,—‘Return into the land of thy fathers and to thy kindred, and *I will be with thee*.’ Again, when God sent Moses to deliver Israel;—‘And Moses said to God: Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh, and should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt? And He said to him: *I will be with thee*.’ Before Israel was defeated by the Amalekites, God commanded Moses: ‘Say to them: Go not up,

The peculiar force
of
the words.

Tractatus
de
Ecclesia Christi,
vol. ii. p. 199, &c.

Gen. xxvi. 24.

ch. xxxi. 3.

Exod. iii. 11, 12.

Deuteron. i. 42.

- and fight not, for *I am not with you.*' To Josue, God said :—' As I have been with Moses, so *will I be with thee.*' When Israel sinned and fled before their enemies, God showed His presence and assistance by removing the hindrance to their ultimate victory, by threatening them through Josue :—' *I will be no more with you,* till you destroy him that is guilty of this wickedness ;' at the same time putting it into their hearts to do as He commanded, and thus fulfilling His previous promise. It was the greeting of the Angel to Gedeon :—' The Lord *is with thee,* O most valiant of men.' And when God bade him go in his strength and deliver Israel, Gedeon 'answered and said: I beseech Thee, my Lord, wherewith shall I deliver Israel? Behold my family is the meanest in Manasses, and I am the least in my father's house. And the Lord said to him: *I will be with thee:* and thou shalt cut off Madian as one man.'

- This, too, was the Archangel's salutation to her, from whom sprang the Saviour and Deliverer of mankind; to 'Mary, of whom was born Jesus;' Whose name, also, was '*Emmanuel,* which being interpreted is, *God with us.*'—' And the Angel being come in, said unto her: Hail full of grace, the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among women.'—'*Χαῖρε, κεχαριστωμένη ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ.*'

- It is this which St. Peter spoke of the Christ Himself :—' Jesus of Nazareth: how God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were op-

pressed by the devil, *for God was with Him* :—*ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.*

It is this which the Lord Christ has promised to His one Church, and which He will never fail to make good in all its fulness :—*'Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.'*—*All days*, without any intermission, or suspension, or interruption, *I am with you* ; I, the Sun of Justice, who know no setting, who change not like the moon, now more, now less ; I, Emmanuel, *am with you* ; not in different degrees or different ways, according to the variations of the fickle human heart, or as if dependent on its movements ; but, *all days*, I, the great I AM, *am with you*. The very construction of the sentence, in the Greek, is calculated to increase our confidence. It is as if our dearest Lord made haste to unite us with Him, to make both one, to enclose us, as it were, in the midst of His own great and awful, but most soul-assuring, everlasting Name—*I with you* AM—*ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.*

What need we more? Yet Dr. Forbes teaches that Holy Scripture 'does not say what degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the Gospel.' However true this assertion as regards individual churches or individual Christians, it is most gratuitous and unfounded if applied to the universal and everlasting Church of God. Pitiably indeed would be the lot of the poor human race if for the universal blessings of the Gospel they were depen-

See above, p. 73.

dent upon human merits. The sins of man did not prevent the coming of the Messiah (though it is maintained that they did so by certain of the Jews), nor shall they hinder the fulfilment of the work He came to do, by lessening His blessed presence, or dividing His one fold.—‘Behold the Lord God shall come with strength, and His arm shall rule: behold His reward is with Him and His work is before Him.’

Isaias xl. 10.

If the words of Christ are not enough, if His prayer and promise can be explained away, what remains but to turn to the overwhelming testimony of those divine prophecies of the ancient covenant, ‘whereunto,’ says the Apostle, ‘you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place’?

2 St. Peter i. 19.

It may not be amiss then, as briefly as possible amidst such a profusion of choice, to select a few of the most prominent of those glowing pledges of the constant, abiding, ever-present, faithful assistance of our dear and loving God, which He has so lavishly vouchsafed to us through the voices of His ancient prophets; as if to relieve a Divine Heart overcharged with love, and with fears lest man should lose his confidence and trust; lest, through sin and infirmity, he should be tempted to doubt of the long-suffering, never-failing, never-tiring, never-exhausted, never-suspended, infinite mercy and patience of Him, Who ‘waiteth that He may have mercy on us: and shall be exalted sparing us:’ Who ‘is compassionate and merciful: long-suffering and plenteous in mercy. . . . Who hath not dealt with us according to our sins: nor rewarded us according to our

Prophecies
of the
Old Testament.

Isaias xxx 18.

Psalm cii.

iniquities. . . . For He knoweth our frame. He remembereth that we are dust.'

'And Sion said: The Lord hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her infant, so as not to have pity on the son of her womb? and if she should forget, yet will not I forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee in my hands: thy walls are always before my eyes.'

Isaias xlix. 14-16.

'A child is born to us, and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the World to come, the Prince of Peace. His empire shall be multiplied, and there shall be no end of peace: He shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom: to establish it and strengthen it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever: the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.'

Ch. ix. 6, 7.

'And now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and formed thee, O Israel: Fear not, for I have redeemed thee, and called thee by thy name: thou art mine. When thou shalt pass through the waters, I will be with thee, and the rivers shall not cover thee: when thou shalt walk in the fire, thou shalt not be burnt, and the flames shall not burn in thee: For I am the Lord thy God; the holy One of Israel, thy Saviour.'

Isaias xliii.

'Lift up your eyes to heaven, and look down to the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish like smoke, and the earth shall be worn away like a garment, and the inhabitants thereof shall perish in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my justice shall not fail.'

Ibid. ch. li. 6.

'I will make an everlasting covenant with you, the faithful mercies of David. . . . and the Lord shall be named for an everlasting sign, that shall not be taken away.'

Isaias lv. 3, 13.

'Because thou wast forsaken, and hated, and there was none that passed through thee, I will make thee to be an everlasting glory, a joy unto generation and generation.'

Ch. lx. 15.

'For as the new heavens, and the new earth, which I make to stand before me, saith the Lord: so shall your

Ch. lxxvi. 22, 23.

seed stand, and your name. And there shall be month after month, and sabbath after sabbath: and all flesh shall come to adore before my face, saith the Lord.'

Isaias lix. 20, 21.

'And there shall come a redeemer to Sion, and to them that return from iniquity in Jacob, saith the Lord. This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.'

Ch. liv. 9-13.

'This thing is to me as in the days of Noe, to whom I swore, that I would no more bring in the waters of Noe upon the earth: so have I sworn not to be angry with thee, and not to rebuke thee. For the mountains shall be moved, and the hills shall tremble: but my mercy shall not depart from thee, and the covenant of my peace shall not be moved: said the Lord that hath mercy on thee.

'O poor little one, tossed with tempest, without all comfort, behold I will lay thy stones in order, and will lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy bulwarks of jasper: and thy gates of graven stones, and all thy borders of desirable stones. All thy children shall be taught of the Lord: and great shall be the peace of thy children.'

Ibid. 17.

'No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper: and every tongue that resisteth thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn. This is the inheritance of the servants of the Lord, and their justice with me, saith the Lord.'

These magnificent prophecies are, of themselves, a sufficient answer to any theory which is based on the assumption that 'the blessings of the Gospel' can be 'forfeited' to the universal Church, or 'the fulness of the presence' of her God within her 'lessened,' or 'abated.'—Though the hills and mountains tremble, yet God's '*mercy shall not depart from her, nor His covenant of peace be moved.*' When God breaks His

oath to Noe, and sin brings back ‘the waters of Noe upon the earth;’ then, and then only, will He forget or fail in His promise to the Church,—‘*I have sworn not to be angry with thee, and not to rebuke thee.*’ Then only need we fear for a suspension of her outward unity. He has laid her ‘stones in order,’ and there shall be no division to displace them.

It is remarkable that the promise to Noe, to which God here appeals in confirmation of His oath to the Christian Church, is expressly grounded on the frailty of man and his liability to evil.—‘And the Lord smelled a sweet savour, and said: I will no more curse the earth for the sake of man: for the imagination and thought of man’s heart are prone to evil from his youth: therefore I will no more destroy every living soul as I have done.’

Genes. viii. 21.

The promises of God to His Church are in like manner independent of human frailty.

Isaias is not the only one who is charged with these glad messages. They have a place amidst the divine strains of the sweet Psalmist of Israel:—

‘The mercies of the Lord I will sing for ever. I will shew forth thy truth with my mouth to generation and generation. For thou hast said: Mercy shall be built up for ever in the heavens: thy truth shall be prepared in them. I have made a covenant with my elect, I have sworn to David my servant: Thy seed will I settle for ever. And I will build up thy throne unto generation and generation.’

Psalm lxxxviii. 1-5.

‘Then thou spakest in a vision to thy saints, and saidst: I have laid help upon one that is mighty, and have exalted

1b. lxxxviii. 20-38.

one chosen out of my people. I have found David my servant : with my holy oil I have anointed him. For my hand shall help him : and my arm shall strengthen him. The enemy shall have no advantage over him : nor the son of iniquity have power to hurt him. And I will cut down his enemies before his face ; and them that hate him I will put to flight. And my truth and my mercy shall be with him : and in my name shall his horn be exalted. And I will set his hand in the sea : and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry out to me : Thou art my father : my God, and the support of my salvation. And I will make him my first-born, high above the kings of the earth.

‘ I will keep my mercy for him for ever : and my covenant faithful to him. And I will make his seed to endure for evermore : and his throne as the days of heaven. And if his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments : If they profane my justices : and keep not my commandments : I will visit their iniquities with a rod : and their sins with stripes. But my mercy I will not take away from him : nor will I suffer my truth to fail. Neither will I profane my covenant : and the words that proceed from my mouth I will not make void.

‘ Once have I sworn by my holiness : I will not lie unto David : his seed shall endure for ever. And his throne as the sun before me : and as the moon perfect for ever, and a faithful witness in heaven.’

These promises
are
abiding.

These promises are to the Christian Church, and they guarantee to us that throughout the whole period of her time-enduring existence, not any ‘ degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the Gospel.’ It cannot be denied that amongst those blessings, unity, in all its fulness, outward and inward, visible and invisible, holds a pre-eminent position.

In the verses which follow the above, the inspired

Psalmist bewails the apparent breach of God's covenant; but his words are to be there understood in their primary sense, as applied to the Jewish nation, and the temporal David. It is thus that St. Augustine interprets them, as intended to assure us that the previous promises belong to Christ and to His Church.—

‘Lest a Christian, who affirmed that these promises were spoken of Christ, should be answered that they referred to David, and he should fall into error if he saw that they all were fulfilled in David; for this reason, He has brought to nought these promises in David, in order that, when you perceive that those things which necessarily must be fulfilled are not fulfilled in him, you may seek another, in whom they may be shown to be fulfilled.’—A little further on he adds: ‘Perhaps God was about to say to thee, “I swore indeed and promised, but this one would not persevere.” What then, didst not Thou, the Lord God, foreknow that this one would not persevere? Certainly Thou knewest. . . . It is removed from this David, that it might not be expected in this David. Expect, therefore, that which I have promised.’—Present to the sight of God was the whole course of the Christian Church; foreseen by Him were all the sins of her future children, when He made with her His ‘everlasting covenant, the faithful mercies of David.’

God has not promised His Church exemption from worldly troubles. ‘If his children forsake my law, &c., I will visit their iniquities with a rod: and

In Psalm. lxxxviii.
Enarrat. Serm. ii. n. 6.

Isaias, Iv. 3.

The Church
is not
exempt from
affliction.

- Heb. xii. 6. their sins with stripes.' We know that 'whom the
 Prov. iii. 12. Lord loveth, He chastiseth;' and Christ has told us :
 St. John xvi. 33. —'In the world you shall have distress : but have
 confidence, I have overcome the world.'
- See above, p. 73. Dr. Forbes says :—'The body is mangled, but we
 This chastisement believe not severed, through loss of intercommu-
 is nion.'—Christ's body hung 'mangled' on the cross ;
 temporal. yet not 'a bone of Him' was broken. Not one of
 St. John xix. his blessed limbs or members sustained the 'loss of
 intercommunion.' His seamless coat was at the
 mercy of a rude soldiery ; yet, as if to show how
 His providence would protect His Church's unity,
 not one of them was suffered to divide it, or to rend it.
- Cant. Cantic. i. 4. The Church is 'black' through afflictions, but
 always 'beautiful;' and without visible unity there
 is no beauty, nor can there be any order. The
 absence of unity and of order denotes the absence of
 God. It is one of the characteristics of hell. 'A
 land of misery and darkness, where the shadow of
 death, and no order, but everlasting horror dwell-
 eth.' Great are the trials, the sufferings, and the
 afflictions of Christ's Church, but the words of the
 Spouse shall ever remain divinely true concerning
 her :—'Thou art beautiful, O my love, sweet and
 comely as Jerusalem : terrible as an army set in
 array.' Where would be the terrors of an army
 which had 'lost its intercommunion' ? How could
 it be sweet and comely, and terrible in its strong
 array, if its outward unity were suspended ? The
 Spouse Himself declares His beloved to be but One.

‘One is my dove, my perfect one is but one, she is the only one of her mother, the chosen of her that bore her.’ And, again, he recalls the goodly array of an army terrible in its united ranks :—‘ Who is she that cometh forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array ’ ?

Cant. Cantic. vi. 8.

Ibid. 9.

Such is the picture of the Christian Church, as drawn by God’s Spirit of truth. Can there be found on earth any communion but one, which corresponds to the delineation? These words find their fulfilment in the Roman Catholic Church alone, and in that one favoured creature, the Church’s spotless Queen and type; the ever-blessed Mary; Mother of our God, and of ourselves; who was herself the firstfruits of the redeeming blood of that Son she gave to man.

There are other prophecies which appear to pledge God’s word not only to the perpetual fulness of the Gospel blessings, but also that He will Himself preserve His Church from any such ‘shortcoming’ as might forfeit them. Thus God says by the prophet Osee :—

‘I will espouse thee to me for ever: and I will espouse thee to me in justice, and judgment, and in mercy, and in commiserations. And I will espouse thee to me in faith: and thou shalt know that I am the Lord.’

Ch. ii. 19, 20.

By the mouth of Ezechiel, He says :—

‘I will pour upon you clean water, and you shall be cleansed from all your filthiness, and I will cleanse you

Ch. xxxvi. 25–29.

from all your idols. And will give you a new heart, and put a new spirit within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit in the midst of you: and I will cause you to walk in my commandments, and to keep my judgments, and do them. And you shall dwell in the land which I gave to your fathers, and you shall be my people, and I will be your God. And I will save you from all your uncleannesses: and I will call for corn, and will multiply it, and will lay no famine upon you.'

The same prophet foretells also the unity of the Church:—

Ezekiel xxxvii.
22-28.

'I will make them one nation in the land on the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king over them all: and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided any more into two kingdoms. Nor shall they be defiled any more with their idols, nor with their abominations, nor with all their iniquities: and I will save them out of all the places in which they have sinned, and I will cleanse them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God. And my servant David shall be king over them, and they shall have one shepherd: they shall walk in my judgments, and shall keep my commandments, and shall do them. And they shall dwell in the land which I gave to my servant Jacob, wherein your fathers dwelt, and they shall dwell in it, they and their children, and their children's children, for ever: and David my servant shall be their prince for ever. And I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will establish them, and will multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for ever. And my tabernacle shall be with them: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the nations shall know that I am the Lord the sanctifier of Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for ever.'

Ch. xxxix. 23.

'And I will hide my face no more from them, for I have

poured out my spirit upon all the house of Israel, saith the Lord God.'

God's word is not less explicit through the prophet Jeremias :—

'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel : As yet Jerem. xxxi. 23-25.
shall they say this word in the land of Juda, and in the
cities thereof, when I shall bring back their captivity : The
Lord bless thee, the beauty of justice, the holy mountain.
And Juda and all his cities shall dwell therein together :
the husbandmen and they that drive the flocks. For I
have inebriated the weary soul : and I have filled every
hungry soul. . . . And as I have watched over them, to
pluck up, and to throw down, and to scatter, and destroy,
and afflict : so will I watch over them, to build up, and to
plant them, saith the Lord.'

Ibid. 28.

'Behold the days shall come, saith the Lord, and I will
make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with
the house of Juda : not according to the covenant which I
made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by
the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt : the
covenant which they made void, and I had dominion over
them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that
I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith
the Lord : I will give my law in their bowels, and I will
write it in their heart : and I will be their God, and they
shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every
man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying :
Know the Lord : for all shall know me from the least of
them even to the greatest, saith the Lord : for I will for-
give their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

Ibid. 31-37.

'Thus saith the Lord, who giveth the sun for the light of
the day, the order of the moon and of the stars, for the
light of the night : who stirreth up the sea, and the waves
thereof roar, the Lord of hosts is his name. If these ordi-
nances shall fail before me, saith the Lord : then also the

seed of Israel shall fail, so as not to be a nation before me for ever.

‘Thus saith the Lord: If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I also will cast away all the seed of Israel, for all that they have done, saith the Lord.’

Well might St. John Chrysostom declare that,—
 ‘Nothing is stronger than the Church.’ ‘Nothing is more powerful than the Church.’ ‘The Church is stronger than heaven itself.’ ‘The Church is more loved by God than heaven itself.’

Hom. de Capt.
 Eutropio. n. 6.
 Hom. ante Exil.

Jeremias also foretells, as distinctly as others, the continuity of succession in the house of David, which manifestly must be understood of a spiritual succession, since the temporal has ceased long ago. This is clearly fulfilled in the person of Christ; but in Him it is fulfilled continuously, whereas the prophecy appears to point to a succession of occupants of the throne of David, which can only have its fulfilment in the Supreme Pontiff who sits on the chair of St. Peter, established on Jesus Christ the Son of David, and from which He Himself rules in the person of His Vicar.

Jeremias
 xxxiii. 11-22.

‘Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform the good word that I have spoken to the house of Israel, and to the house of Juda. In those days, and at that time, I will make the bud of justice to spring forth unto David, and he shall do judgment and justice in the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell securely: and this is the name that they shall call him, The Lord our just one.

‘For thus saith the Lord: There shall not be cut off from

David a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Neither shall there be cut off from the priests and Levites a man before my face, to offer holocausts, and to burn sacrifices, and to kill victims continually.

‘And the word of the Lord came to Jeremias, saying : Thus saith the Lord : If my covenant with the day can be made void, and my covenant with the night, that there should not be day and night in their season : also my covenant with David my servant may be made void, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the Levites and priests my ministers. As the stars of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea be measured : so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites my ministers.’

Lastly, as if our dear God would still further protect us from the fear that our ‘shortcoming’ might ‘forfeit the blessings of the Gospel,’ He puts into the mouth of this prophet also, a direct assurance that He will evermore preserve us from so dire a curse, promising that He will not cease to do His people good, and will never suffer them to revolt from Him :—

‘They shall be my people, and I will be their God. And I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me all days : and that it may be well with them, and with their children after them. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, and will not cease to do them good : and I will give my fear in their heart, that they may not revolt from me.

‘And I will rejoice over them, when I shall do them good : and I will plant them in this land in truth, with my whole heart, and with all my soul.

‘For thus saith the Lord : as I have brought upon this people all this great evil : so will I bring upon them all the good that I now speak to them.’

Jeremias
xxxii. 38-42.

God appeals to His past fidelity to His word, which He evinced in punishing His people's sin. Under the old covenant, heavy judgments were foretold and threatened to the Jewish nation as attendant on the breach of God's law. The people broke it and the judgments fell upon them. Under the new covenant, there are still threats of judgment to individual unrepentant sinners, and to individual churches; but there is not the remotest allusion to them as affecting the Universal Church. On the contrary, our God seems never to weary of assuring us that His covenant of peace with us shall be *everlasting*; His sanctuary in the midst of us *for ever*. 'And *I will no more hide My face from them*, for I have poured out My spirit upon all the house of Israel, saith the Lord God.' He appeals to His fidelity to the covenant of justice, in order to increase our confidence in His fidelity to the covenant of mercy. For His 'mercy exalteth itself above judgment.' He tells us that the new covenant shall not be like the old one which our fathers 'made void'; 'but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will give my law in their bowels, and I will write it in their heart: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people'; and He adds, that it shall be as sure in its duration as the order of the sun that lights the day, and of the moon and the stars by night.

In the fulness of the ages 'our God was seen upon earth,' clothed in our flesh and blood, and ere

Vide supra.

St. James ii. 13.

‘He ascended on high,’ and carried our human nature to His throne of glory, He summed up all the long centuries of prophecy, type, and promise, in one sure pledge of His everlasting love :—*Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*

It has been shown that these prophecies included the promises of unity, and of holiness, and that there should never be any cessation of God’s benefits :—

‘*I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me all days : and that it may be well with them, and with their children after them. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, and will not cease to do them good : and I will give my fear in their heart, that they may not revolt from me.*’ Vide supra, p. 145.

This and much more has He pledged to us : this and much more must be answered, by any who think to plead before the judgment seat of Christ, as an excuse for separation from His visible fold, that man’s sin has overcome God’s mercy ; that ‘the fulness’ of Christ’s presence is ‘abated’ in His Church ; that ‘He has not promised to be always present in the same degree and the same way’ ; and that ‘Holy Scripture does not say what degree of shortcoming shall forfeit the blessings of the gospel.’

These promises
leave
no excuse.

Every Christian must agree with Dr. Forbes’s exhortation not ‘to shape the gospel into a theory that suits us.’ Let us then apply the gospel test to the theory now before us. Let us see whether such a theory is compatible with the divine words and the

The theory
tested.
Vide supra, p. 74.

divine precepts of the gospel; whether it is possible, at one and the same time, to believe the said words, and to maintain the said theory; to act on the said theory, and to obey the said precepts.

The theory
is
inconsistent
with
Gospel doctrine.
St. John x. 16.
See above, pp. 7-14.

The gospel says that 'there shall be one fold and one shepherd'; and Christ's dying prayer is a pledge to us, that such unity can neither be hidden, nor ever fail. The theory declares that this fold has become outwardly divided; with flocks who no longer feed or dwell together, and shepherds who are at disagreement with one another.—For 'one fold and one shepherd,' it points to separated flocks, with separated folds and separated shepherds.

Daniel ii. 44.

The prophet Daniel foretells that Christ's kingdom upon earth 'shall never be destroyed,' . . . 'it shall break in pieces, and shall consume all these kingdoms: and itself shall stand for ever.' Now, a kingdom is a reality; it is visible, and tangible; it implies a head to govern it. Is it replied that the Church is ruled by Christ, invisibly, from above? Be it so: but it requires a visible head to rule a visible kingdom, and to preserve its visible existence. Whereas, according to the theory before us, Christ is represented on earth by many and divided Viceroy's, and the people and the rulers who are said to form His one kingdom, are broken up into bodies 'not at one with another' 'even in grave things'; amongst others, 'not at one' even as to the visible church which His subjects are to obey in His Name; 'not at one' as to the constitution of

See extract, p. 73.

their Master's kingdom ; ' not at one ' as to whether it is true that He elected one chosen Apostle for His Vicar, and ordained that the said Vicariate should always continue, vested in that Apostle's successors ; and therefore ' not at one ' as to His will concerning men's obedience to the Apostolic See, which many of them fear not to accuse of arrogant presumption. Many more ' grave things ' there are, as will be shown, on which Christian Bishops and Christian peoples are, evidently, ' not at one with one another.' If these all belong to one king ; if these all make up one kingdom ; it must be to a king whose commands may be interpreted after the varying pleasure of His diverse subjects ; it must be a kingdom whose members are ' not at one with another '! What is this, in other words, but a kingdom divided against itself ?

How then shall the prophecy be fulfilled ? How then shall Christ's kingdom ' stand for ever ' ? Three of the gospels repeat His own solemn words :—

' Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate : and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand.'—St. Matt. xii. 25.

' If a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand.'—St. Mark iii. 24, 25.

' Every kingdom divided against itself shall be brought to desolation, and house upon house shall fall.'—St. Luke xi. 17.

Which alternative is to be accepted ? The word of God, or the theory of man ? God has said that ' every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate ' and ' cannot stand ' : yet that Christ's

kingdom ‘shall stand for ever.’ If both these words of the eternal Truth, be true, then that theory must be false which assumes, that Christ’s kingdom can be divided; its rulers and people, ‘even in grave things, not at one with one another’; its ‘unhappy divisions’ such, ‘that we cannot meet, even to heal them.’

Such divisions are inconsistent with the gospel picture of the Church, nor can it be wrested into a shape to suit the theory that these visibly divided bodies still are inwardly one in Christ.

Christ has promised that ‘the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church.’ What are the ‘gates of hell’ but sins, and heresies, and schisms; ‘divisions and want of love’? These have their place outside, they appertain not to Christ’s kingdom. They may find insidious entrance into the hearts of individuals within His fold, but they never shall prevail within her, or against her, so that ‘the fulness’ of her Lord’s ‘Presence’ should thereby become ‘abated.’

But more,—there are precepts of the gospel, which, if this theory were true, it would be utterly impossible to obey.

Christ sent forth His Apostles, saying:—‘Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.’ Christ taught to His disciples:—‘If thy brother will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.’ When He sent forth the gospel messengers, He told them:—‘He that

Vid. sup. pp. 73, 74.

St. Matt. xvi. 18.

The theory
is
inconsistent
with
Gospel precepts.

St. Mark xvi. 15, 16.

St. Matt. xviii. 17.

St. Luke x. 16.

heareth you, heareth Me : and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me. And he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me.'

St. Paul accordingly admonishes us,—‘Remember your prelates who have spoken the word of God to you : whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation, Jesus Christ yesterday, and to-day : and the same for ever. Be not led away with various and strange doctrines.’ . . . ‘Obey your prelates and be subject to them.’—At the same time, He, elsewhere, cautions us most emphatically, ‘Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so now I say again : If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema.’

Now, by what means are we to discern between ‘another gospel,’ which is ‘anathema,’ and ‘the faith once delivered to the saints,’ which ‘he that believeth not shall be condemned’? Clearly, through the teaching of Christ in that one Church which legitimately represents to us the college of the Apostles, to which he confided that great deposit; and which St. Paul declares to be ‘the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.’ It is admitted, on all sides, that the Roman Catholic Church belongs to this Church of Christ, although Anglicans claim the same privilege for the national Church of England. They do not call in question the apostolical descent of the Roman Catholic Bishops, though

Heb. xiii. 7-9.

Ibid. 17.

Gal. i. 8, 9.

1 Tim. iii. 15.

they maintain that the Church of England possesses a like succession. The theory maintains that Rome and England are one in Christ. But these two societies teach opposite doctrines on vital points. How then is the true faith to be ascertained? How are we to distinguish it from 'various and strange doctrines'? If it is replied that the points of difference are not vital, I answer that the Roman Catholic Church teaches that they are so, and that this variation, of itself, constitutes a discrepancy which is vital.

According to this theory of inward unity under outward division, it is impossible for any man now to 'hear the Church.' How can we hearken in true obedience to the Church in communion with Rome, and at the same time listen dutifully to a community which renounces her allegiance? The Roman Catholic Church asserts that to her alone the gospel message is committed; that she speaks with Divine authority, as the true and only representative of those who were sent forth by Christ 'into the whole world, to preach the gospel to every creature,' with the warning that 'he that believeth not shall be condemned.' England denies her exclusive mission, refuses to bow to her authority, and disbelieves her testimony to the gospel message. I repeat that, if both these communions form part of the one Church of God, it has now become impossible for any man to 'hear the Church' in obedience to the commands of Christ. This is enough to prove the falsehood of the theory, for God never commands impossibilities.

Again,—if the Archbishop of Westminster and the Archbishop of Canterbury are, both of them, prelates in the one church (though outwardly differing), it follows that every English Christian is bound in conscience to follow ‘the faith’ of them both, to ‘obey’ them both, and to ‘be subject to’ them both. If not, he is disobedient to the voice of God through St. Paul. But no man can serve two masters, or be subject to two prelates whose commands are in direct opposition to each other. No man can follow the faith of those who are at variance respecting the faith. If both churches are one in Christ, then the Prelates of both speak equally in the name of Christ, Who said :—‘He that heareth you, heareth Me : and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me.’ How, then, shall we escape ‘despising’ Him who is our All, if both these messengers are from Him ? How are we to ‘hear’ Westminster without ‘despising’ Canterbury ? How listen to Canterbury without ‘despising’ Westminster ? Nay, Anglicans acknowledge Rome, at least as their Patriarchal See, yet they refuse to ‘hear’ its Bishop ; and the majority of their communion who visit the city, ‘despise’ the voice of its Pontiff ; acting as if the great centre of Christendom were, for them, a mere portion of the diocese of Gibraltar. If it be replied that Rome has no title to the position which she claims, what is this but to ‘despise’ the voice of the Roman Catholic Bishops throughout the world, whose divine commission is nevertheless acknowledged ?

These are practical questions, and the gospel is a practical religion; and not only practical, but practicable. How will this theory teach men to obey it?

Is this the gospel of peace, waited for with the expectancy of long and weary ages, by Saints, and Seers, and Sages of all time? This, the fulfilment of God's sure and universal promises?—

Isaias xxx. 20. 'Thy eyes shall see thy teacher.'—'The work of
Ibid. xxxii. 17, 18. justice shall be peace, and the service of justice quietness, and security for ever. And My people shall sit in the beauty of peace, and in the tabernacles of confidence, and in wealthy rest.'—When compared with such a prophecy, is not the theory plainly 'another gospel'? Hear again the prophet Ezechiel:—'I will feed them in the mountains of Israel, by the rivers, and in all the habitations of the land: I will feed them in the most fruitful pastures, and their pastures shall be in the high mountains of Israel: there shall they rest on the green grass, and be fed in fat pastures upon the mountains of Israel. I will feed My sheep: and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord God.'

Ezech. xxxiv. 13,
14, 15.

Ibid. 23, 24.

'AND I WILL SET UP ONE SHEPHERD OVER THEM, and he shall feed them, even my servant David: he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God: and My servant David the prince in the midst of them: I the Lord have spoken it.'

Neither the prophets nor the gospel tell of an outwardly divided Church. Let us accept their divine teaching with the simplicity of children.

The theory in question affirms that, in spite of their serious divisions, the three principal religious communions of Christendom still are inwardly one in the faith. Dr. Forbes says:—‘We bear separate witness still to the One Faith which Christ gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds; we all look to Him as truly present in His Sacraments, truly giving His own Body and Blood; we all hold to the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, teaching those same truths which they taught, and holding sacred the descent from them.’

Differences
respecting faith.

See extract above,
p. 73.

It is a painful necessity when a wound must be probed. Still, in a case of life or death, the operation is preferable to self-deception. When God’s truth is concerned, He wills not that men should delude themselves or one another, by the cry of ‘Peace, Peace,’ where in His sight no peace exists. It is with the differences between England and Rome that we are most immediately and practically concerned, and it would be a false charity to shrink from exposing either their nature or their extent. Far be it from me to widen the division or to add fuel to the fire of strife, but a deadly wound cannot be healed by concealment, nor are hindrances to reconciliation removed by being ignored.

It is true that in one sense, the difficulties are less than they are often imagined to be. For, if the teaching of Rome were rightly understood, it would commend itself to all true Christian hearts, and, so far from deterring, it would draw them to her fold. Yet it is a fallacy and a delusion to suppose that England

Difference
as to
the ground of faith.

and Rome are inwardly united in one faith. They are at variance not only respecting the articles of the faith, but also, as to the actual foundation of the faith; as to the ground on which mankind are to accept the Scriptures, and the Creeds, and the whole of the Divine revelation,—the whole of Christianity.

Roman Catholics accept it all on the ever-living ever-present, testimony of the Church of God; of that Church whose infallibility Anglicans assert to be suspended. Here, at the commencement, is an irreconcilable discrepancy on a subject which lies at the root of the whole Christian life.

Romans x. 14, 15.

St. Paul asks how men are to believe without having heard? And how hear ‘without a preacher?’ ‘And how shall they preach unless they be sent?’

Catechism
of
Christian Doctrine,
Ch. I.

Every Catholic child is authoritatively taught in his Catechism that faith is ‘to believe without doubting whatever God has revealed’; and that we are to know what God has revealed, ‘by the testimony and authority of the Catholic Church, which Christ has appointed to teach all nations.’ Here then is the preacher sent by Christ Himself, without whom, as St. Paul tells us, we cannot even hear God’s truth, and therefore cannot possibly believe it to salvation. Thus far, it may be, both sides are agreed. But there remains the essential question:—Where at this moment is to be found this authorized preacher of Christ’s gospel? Where is now the voice of the Catholic Church? On this point Rome and England are divided, and the difference is insuperable. The Catechism I have just quoted, and whose exclusive

use is enjoined by authority for English Catholics, thus instructs us on the subject :—

Q. What is the Catholic Church ?

A. The union of all the faithful under one Head.

Q. Who is that Head ?

A. Christ Jesus our Lord.

Q. Has not the Church a visible head on earth ?

A. Yes ; the Bishop of Rome, who is the Vicar of Christ.

Q. Why is the Bishop of Rome the head of the Church ?

A. Because he is the successor of St. Peter, whom Christ appointed to be the head of the Church.

Q. How do you prove that Christ appointed St. Peter to be the head of the Church ?

A. Because he said to him : ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it : and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’

Q. What is the Bishop of Rome called ?

A. He is called the Pope, which word signifies Father.

Q. Is then the Pope our spiritual Father ?

A. Yes ; he is the spiritual Father of all the faithful.

Ninth Article
of the
Creed.

Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

This is Rome’s formal faith respecting the constitution of the Catholic Church. Is it true that the ‘Church of England’ bears ‘separate witness’ to this same faith ? Does she accept the above as a true description whereby to discern, in this nineteenth century, the one exclusive Church of Christ ? From that Church alone can we learn God’s revelation. Therefore, if we differ as to the essential marks by which that Church must be recognised, or as to the infallibility of her present voice, we differ as to the very ground of all Christian belief,—we differ as to the channel through which, at this present moment,

‘the faith once delivered to the saints’ is divinely explained to man. How can they be one in the faith, who are at variance respecting the teacher of the faith?

It is asserted by Anglicans that the Church, in which men are to believe, has lost her power of speech, or that her language is now rendered incoherent, through external division. Amongst Roman Catholics it is taught to be of faith, that the Church is always visibly united, under the visible rule of the Roman Pontiff; and that she is now, as ever, our audible teacher, our infallible guide in faith and in morals. The former hold that, for the present, her voice is suspended; that each man must gather her teaching from memories long since past, as seems right in his own eyes; and that her ‘unhappy divisions’ are such, ‘that we cannot meet, even to heal them.’ The latter believe in her constant outward unity, and constant unerring voice.

Thus Rome and England are at variance as to the foundation of the whole Christian faith. Are they agreed as to its individual Articles?

Ubi supra.

Dr. Forbes says:—‘We bear separate witness still to the one faith which Christ gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds.’ Now, such witness cannot be given without mutual agreement respecting the full sense of the Creeds. Mere outward agreement in the *words* of the Creeds may exist without agreement as to their meaning, or as to the faith which they express. Thus the Creed of the Apostles is explained by the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian; and no one can be said to bear witness to the faith of the first,

unless he cordially accept the two latter as one with it. Is it then true that Rome and England are agreed as to 'the faith of the Creeds'? It can be only one faith. Is it a fact that they 'bear separate witness' to it as such? Do they interpret those Creeds alike?

The large latitude which exists in the 'Church of England' renders it difficult to define her teaching very precisely. At the same time, there are certain salient points of difference, which render clear and apparent the vital separation that exists in matters of doctrine, between herself and the Roman Catholic Church, whose faith is definite and marked, and is professed with no uncertain voice.

The following declarations, as to certain articles of the Roman faith, are taken from sources whose authority cannot be called in question. They form a portion of her formal and dogmatic teaching, and I shall not hesitate to give them at greater length than, perhaps, may seem absolutely necessary, in order that they may be the better understood. I begin with the authoritative Profession of Faith sometimes called the Creed of Pope Pius IV. After reciting the Nicene Creed, which, amongst other articles, professes belief in 'One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church,' it proceeds as follows:—

'I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

'I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church hath held and doth hold, to whom it belongeth to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take

and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

‘I also profess that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one: to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony: and that they confer grace: and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order cannot be repeated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

‘I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.

‘I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calleth Transubstantiation. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament.

‘I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

• ‘Likewise, that the Saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

‘I most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, of the Mother of God ever Virgin, and also of other Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

‘I also affirm that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

‘I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

‘I likewise undoubtingly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church hath condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

‘I, *N. N.*, do at this present freely profess and sincerely hold to this true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved: and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, by God’s assistance, to the end of my life.’

Now, if England really bore witness to this faith, and taught this doctrine to be the true sense of the Creeds, there would be no need of further argument. If her members will but accept it, and render the true obedience here promised to the Vicar of Jesus Christ in the person of the Roman Pontiff, the separation will be at end. If not, how can it be asserted that such separation is merely outward?

To pass on. Do Rome and England ‘bear separate witness’ to one faith respecting the Sacraments?

The grace of Baptism is now, practically, an open question in the Church of England. Therefore, whatever may have been her witness formerly to that article of the Creed, it is for the present at any rate suspended.

The
Supreme Pontiff.

The
Sacraments.

Baptism.

Confirmation.

I know not how the Church of England bears witness that Confirmation is a Sacrament, 'instituted by Jesus Christ.' In any case she has grievously mutilated the manner of its administration. Though retaining an imposition of hands and a form of prayer, she has wholly rejected the signing on the forehead with chrism, which is commonly taught to be essential to the matter of the Sacrament; and she has altered the form of words, which, with the Greeks, is—*Signaculum doni Spiritus Sancti*; and with the Latins—*I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

Catech. Trident.
P. II. c. 3.

This is that Holy Chrism, which, it has been said, was delivered to the Apostles by Christ Himself; and which, in each diocese, His representative, the Bishop, blesses every year with mysterious and impressive rites during the Mass of Maundy Thursday. It is composed of oil and balsam, and can be blessed on no other day. The oil for the sick is previously blessed in the same Mass; but the chrism immediately after the Communion. Twelve priests assist the Bishop, six on either hand, representing the Apostles. Behind him are seven deacons, in memory of the seven they ordained; and behind these, seven sub-deacons, as ministers. This sacred chrism is used in all solemn consecrations, and receives peculiar reverence as a special emblem of God the Holy Ghost. St. Augustine terms Confirmation, the Sacrament of Chrism.

Acts vi.

Cont. litt. Petil.
Lib. ii. n. 239.

The above-cited Profession of Faith is explicit on the doctrine of the Eucharist. God be praised, there may be many Anglicans now who will not on that account turn away, as did the unbelieving disciples in the gospel. But how does their Church as a body, bear witness to this article of the faith? As a rule, is it not contradicted by her authorities, at least in its fulness, though there may be happy exceptions? May it not, in general, be denied by her clergy with greater impunity than it can be maintained?

The
Holy Eucharist.

God again be praised, that so many hearts in the Church of England are awakened and awakening to the unspeakable blessings of auricular confession, and the importance of priestly absolution! But where is her authoritative testimony to the *divine* institution of the blessed Sacrament of Penance; and to the absolute *necessity* for the fallen to have recourse to it in order to obtain the remission of their mortal sins? Is this maintained or taught, even by any of those who are laudably foremost in the advocacy of its use? If so, it must be from their own conviction; it cannot in any sense be said that the 'Church of England' bears witness to this essential portion of the faith, or is at one with Rome in her belief respecting it. The Council of Trent enunciated, as follows, the formal doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject, which is of supreme importance to man's salvation:—

Penance.

'This sacrament of Penance is, for those who have fallen after baptism, necessary unto salvation; as baptism itself is for those who have not as yet been regenerated.'

Session xiv. ch. 2.
Waterworth's
Translation,
p. 94.

Session xiv.
Canon I.
Ibid. p. 107.

‘ If any one saith, that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God, as often as they fall into sin after baptism ; let him be anathema.’

Session xiv.
Canon VI.
Ibid. p. 108.

‘ If any one denieth, either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of divine right ; or saith, that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church hath ever observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention ; let him be anathema.’

If this be the faith of the Church of England, how awful is the guilt of her silence !

Extreme Unction.

It manifestly cannot be asserted that the Church of England bears any kind of witness to the same faith with Rome respecting the blessed Sacrament of Extreme Unction : which was instituted by our merciful Lord to convey help and spiritual support to the sick in the hours of their decisive trial ; to heal and strengthen their souls ; to fortify them against the assaults of Satan in their last agony ; or to restore them to bodily health if God should see it expedient.

The holy Council of Trent, after treating of the Sacrament of Penance, proceeds to instruct the faithful respecting that of Extreme Unction, upon which subject I extract the decrees in full :—

Session xiv.
Waterworth's
Translation,
pp. 104-107.

‘ ON THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.’

‘ It hath also seemed good to the holy Synod, to subjoin, to the preceding doctrine on Penance, the following on the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which by the Fathers was regarded as being the completion (*consummativum*), not only of penance, but also of the whole Christian life, which

ought to be a perpetual penance. First, therefore, as regards its institution. It declares and teaches, that our most gracious Redeemer,—who would have His servants at all times provided with salutary remedies against all the weapons of all their enemies,—as, in the other sacraments, He prepared the greatest aids, whereby, during life, Christians may preserve themselves whole from every more grievous spiritual evil, so did He guard the close of life, by the sacrament of Extreme Unction, as with a most firm defence. For though *our adversary* seeks and seizes opportunities, all our life long, to be able in any way to devour our souls; yet is there no time wherein he strains more vehemently all the powers of his craft to ruin us utterly, and, if he can possibly, to make us fall even from trust in the mercy of God, than when he perceives the end of our life to be at hand.’

CHAPTER I.

ON THE INSTITUTION OF THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

‘Now, this sacred unction of the sick was instituted by Christ our Lord, as truly and properly a sacrament of the new law, insinuated indeed in Mark, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the Apostle, and brother of the Lord. *Is any man, he saith, sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.* In which words, as the Church has learned from apostolic tradition, received from hand to hand, he teaches the matter, the form, the proper minister, and the effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church has understood the matter thereof to be oil blessed by a Bishop. For the unction very aptly represents the grace of the Holy Ghost, with which the soul of the sick person is invisibly anointed: and furthermore, that those words, “By this unction,” &c. &c., are the form.’ St. James v. 14, 15.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE EFFECT OF THIS SACRAMENT.

‘ Moreover, the thing signified (*res*) and the effect of this sacrament are explained in those words; *And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him.* For the thing here signified is the grace of the Holy Ghost; whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, as also the remains of sins; *and raises up* and strengthens the soul of the sick person, by exciting in him a great confidence in the Divine mercy; whereby the sick being supported, bears more easily the inconveniences and pains of his sickness; and more readily resists the temptations of the devil, who *lies in wait for his heel*; and at times obtains bodily health, when expedient for the welfare of the soul.’

Gen. iii. 15.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE MINISTER OF THIS SACRAMENT, AND ON THE TIME WHEN IT SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED.

‘ And now as to prescribing who ought to receive, and who to administer, this sacrament,—this also was not obscurely delivered in the words above cited. For it is there also shown, that the proper ministers of this sacrament are the *Presbyters of the Church*; by which name are to be understood, in that place, not the elders by age, or the foremost in dignity amongst the people, but, either bishops, or priests by bishops rightly ordained *by the imposition of the hands of the priesthood*. It is also declared, that this unction is to be applied to the sick, but to those especially who lie in such danger as to seem to be about to depart this life; whence also it is called the sacrament of the departing. And if the sick should, after having received this unction, recover, they may again be aided by the succour of this sacrament, when they fall into another like danger of death. Wherefore, they are on no account to be hearkened to, who, against so manifest and clear a sentence

1 Tim. iv. 14.

(*sententiam*) of the Apostle James, teach, either that this unction is a human figment or is a rite received from the Fathers, which neither has a command from God, nor a promise of grace : nor those who assert that it has already ceased, as though it were only to be referred to the grace of healing in the primitive church ; nor those who say that the rite and usage which the holy Roman Church observes in the administration of this sacrament is repugnant to the sentiment of the Apostle James, and that it is therefore to be changed into some other : nor, finally, those who affirm that this Extreme Unction may without sin be contemned by the faithful : for all these things are most manifestly at variance with the perspicuous words of so great an apostle. Neither, assuredly, does the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all other churches, observe aught in administering this unction,—as regards those things which constitute the substance of this sacrament,—but what blessed James has prescribed. Nor indeed can there be contempt of so great a sacrament without a heinous sin, and an injury to the Holy Ghost Himself. These are the things which this holy Œcumenical Synod professes and teaches and proposes to all the faithful of Christ, to be believed and held, touching the sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction. And it delivers the following canons to be inviolably preserved ; and condemns and anathematizes those who assert what is contrary thereto.’

Two of the canons here referred to, respecting Penance, have already been given. I subjoin the three first of those which regard Extreme Unction :—

‘ CANON I.—If any one saith, that Extreme Unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James ; but is only a rite received from the Fathers, or a human figment ; let him be anathema.’ Ibid. pp. 110, 111.

‘ CANON II.—If any one saith, that the sacred unction

of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor comfort (*alleviare, raise up*) the sick; but that it has already ceased, as though it were of old only the grace of working cures; let him be anathema.'

'CANON III.—If any one saith, that the right and usage of Extreme Unction, which the holy Roman Church observes, is repugnant to the sentiment of the blessed apostle James, and that it is therefore to be changed, and may, without sin, be contemned by Christians; let him be anathema.'

Eirenicon,
pp. 22, 219, &c.

Dr. Pusey appears to think that there is no ground, 'except the custom of the Church, why Extreme Unction should not be used in England.' It is perfectly certain, as has been before observed, that there is no single point on which the Roman doctrine on any subject, need create a difficulty amongst earnest-minded and religious men, if only it were rightly understood. But as things are and have been for the last three centuries, it certainly cannot be maintained that the Church of England has borne any sort of witness to the same faith as that of Rome respecting this holy sacrament; and, if she believes in it at all, it is inconceivable how she can have so systematically withheld it from her members.

Explanations.

This leads to a digression, which I hope will not be thought unseasonable. An opportunity for explanation should never be allowed to escape; and the remarks upon this subject in the 'Eirenicon,' expressly invite an explanation.

Object
of
Extreme Unction.
Eirenicon, p. 223.

First, I ask permission to correct the error into which the learned author of that work has fallen when he says, that 'the Roman Church practically

looks upon Extreme Unction as a mere preparation for death.'

The practice of the Roman Church is at one with her doctrine. The teaching of the Council of Trent has been already stated. Pope Eugenius IV. also instructed the Armenians, at the Council of Florence, that the effects of Extreme Unction were—'the healing of the mind; and, so far as it is expedient, of the body itself also.—*Effectus vero est mentis sanatio; et, in quantum autem expedit, ipsius etiam corporis.*

Hardouin,
Acta Concil.
Tom. ix. col. 440.

The first provincial council of Cologne (A.D. 1536), after treating of the other sacraments, says:—'There remains Extreme Unction, which (since in death there is the last conflict) is applied, that either the sick may recover, if God see fit, or in faith and good hope may fall asleep in the Lord.'

Pars vii. cap. 49,
Hardouin ix.
col. 2011.

Hugo of St. Victor writes respecting it:—'First, the soul is cured, then the body is healed. The body is sick for the correction of the soul. Therefore, in order to obtain the health of the body, the soul must first be cured. And if, perchance, the body is not re-established in its former vigour, there is no danger if only the soul shall have received its health.'

De Sacramentis,
Lib. II. Pars xv. 3.
He died A.D. 1140.

The Roman Ritual teaches as follows:—

'The Sacrament of Extreme Unction, which was instituted by Christ our Lord, as a celestial medicine, for the health (*salutaris*) not only of the soul, but also of the body, is with all zeal and diligence to be applied to those who are dangerously sick; and, indeed, if possible, at that time when their mind and reason are still in full vigour: so that, in order to their fuller reception of the

Rituale Romanum,
De Sacramento
Extreme Unctionis.

grace of the sacrament, they may also on their part contribute faith, and the pious will of the mind, whilst they are anointed with the holy oil.'

Extreme Unction can never be given to anyone whose life is endangered otherwise than by sickness, as it would be if 'practically looked upon as a mere preparation for death.' I subjoin the teaching of the Tridentine Catechism on this point, and as to the proper time for its administration:—

P. II. chap. vi.

St. James v. 14.

'The faithful are to be taught that, although this sacrament appertains to all, certain classes of persons are excepted, to whom it is not to be administered. And in the first place are excepted persons in sound health; for that to them Extreme Unction is not to be given, the Apostle also teaches, when he says: "Is any one sick among you?" and reason shows, for it was instituted to be medicinal not only to the soul, but also to the body. As, then, those only that labour under disease have occasion for cure, so also this sacrament ought to be administered to those who seem to be so dangerously ill that it may be feared lest their last day of life should be near. Those, however, sin very grievously (*gravissime*—a word which denotes *mortal* sin) who are wont to observe that time of anointing a sick person when, all hope of recovery having been already lost, he is beginning to grow dead and senseless; for it is obvious that it avails very much to a more abundant reception of the grace of the sacrament, if the sick man be anointed with the sacred oil whilst the mind and reason are still in vigour, and he can bring to its reception faith and the religious will of the mind. Wherefore, parish priests must take care to apply this heavenly medicine, by its own power at all times most salutary, then especially when they see that its efficacy will also be increased by the piety and devotion of those to whom it is to be administered.

'To no one, therefore, who is not visited by grievous sick-

ness, is it lawful to give the sacrament of *Uction*, even though he is about to incur risk of life; either by undertaking a perilous voyage, or by engaging in battle from which certain death may impend over him, or even though, condemned to capital punishment, he should be hurried off to execution. Furthermore, all who want the use of reason, are not fit to receive this sacrament; nor are children, who are not guilty of any sins, from the remains of which they would have occasion to be healed by the remedial efficacy of this sacrament; nor yet idiots nor madmen, unless they have sometimes the use of reason, and then in particular give signs of piety, and ask to be anointed with the sacred oil. For a person who, from his very birth, never had the use of his mind and reason, is not to be anointed; but if the sick person, whilst yet in sound mind, wished to be made a partaker of this sacrament, and subsequently became insane and delirious, he is to be anointed.'

Cardinal Bellarmine's teaching is the same:—

'Many,' he says, 'fall into a great error, in not wishing to receive this Sacrament till the moment of their passing away; but the proper time to take it is when the physicians judge the malady to be dangerous, and when human remedies do not appear to be sufficient; and therefore recourse is then had to heavenly remedies, and so, not seldom it happens that the sick person is healed by means of the holy oil. Therefore this holy sacrament should not be asked for, when we are not in danger of death, nor yet ought it to be postponed till there is no more any hope. And this is the reason why the holy oil is not given to those who are about to be executed, because such persons are not sick, nor have they any hope of life.'

Explanation
of
Christian Doctrine,
revised
and approved
by the
Ven. Congregation
of the Reform.

The matter of the Sacrament is oil (which must be from olives only) blessed by a bishop. This blessing is given with ceremonial and great solemnity during the mass of Maundy Thursday, the bishop

leaving the altar for the purpose between the consecration and communion. The Roman (Tridentine) Catechism observes, concerning the holy oil :—

Part II. chapter vi.

‘This matter most aptly signifies that which is effected inwardly in the soul by virtue of the Sacrament. For as oil is very efficacious in mitigating bodily pain, so does the virtue of this Sacrament alleviate the sadness and anguish of the soul. Oil also restores health, brings cheerfulness, and affords, as it were, food to light ; whilst it is also very well calculated to restore the strength of a wearied body. All which things declare the effects produced in the sick person by divine power through the administration of this Sacrament.’

The form of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction consists in the following prayer, which is repeated at the anointing of each organ of the senses :—
‘Through this holy unction ✠ and through His most loving mercy, may the Lord forgive (or indulge) thee (*indulgeat tibi*) whereinsoever thou hast trespassed (*quidquid deliquisti*) by sight, hearing, &c. &c.’—
These words breathe more than the mere forgiveness of the guilt of sin ; they imply a fulness of merciful indulgence.

The Roman Catechism observes that the deprecatory form is intimated by St. James, and thus explains it :—

Ubi supra.

‘Nor let anyone be surprised that, whilst the form of the other sacraments either absolutely signifies what the sacrament effects, as when we say, “I baptize thee ;” or “I sign thee with the sign of the cross ;” or is pronounced, as it were, by way of command, as when, in administering the Sacrament of Order, it is said, “Receive power ;” this

form alone of Extreme Unction is accomplished by a certain prayer. For with very good reason has that been ordained ; for since this sacrament is administered, in order that, besides the spiritual grace which it imparts, it may also restore health to the sick ; yet because it does not always follow that the sick recover from their illness, therefore does the form consist of a prayer in order that we may obtain from the goodness of God that which the virtue of the sacrament is not wont to effect in a constant and continual order. Peculiar rites, however, are employed in the administration of this sacrament also, but the chief part of them contains prayers which the priest uses to obtain health for the sick person. For there is no other sacrament which is accomplished (*conficiatur*) with more prayers ; and with reason, for at that time most especially are the faithful to be assisted by pious prayers. Therefore also all others who may happen to be then present, and particularly parish priests, ought to pray to God with all their heart, and with all earnestness to commend to the divine mercy the life and salvation of the sufferer.’

In the Roman Ritual, immediately after the order for administering Extreme Unction, there follow the seven penitential psalms with the litanies, under the heading — ‘For the sick, whilst they are being anointed with the sacred oil, or for other necessity.’

I have dwelt at some length on the special prominence given to prayer in connection with Extreme Unction, because it tends to explain certain passages in which its effects appear to be attributed to the prayer, apart from the anointing. But, just as the term ‘holy oil,’ which is only the *matter* of the sacrament, is frequently used to express the sacrament itself, without mention of the prayer which is its

essential *form*, so it may easily happen that the single word *oratio* is likewise employed at times, as sufficiently designating the whole of the Sacrament.¹ Thus St. James, in his Epistle, seems to use the expression in this sense; and the Roman Catechism also, in the following exhortation to faith and confidence:—

Ch. v. 15.

Ubi supra.

‘Let parish priests strive to persuade the sick man to offer himself to the priest to be anointed, with that faith with which of old those who were to be healed by the Apostles were wont to offer themselves. But first there is to be sought the salvation of the soul, then the health of the body, with this adjunct, if it should be profitable for eternal glory. Nor indeed ought the faithful to doubt, that those holy and solemn prayers are heard by God, which are used by the priest, not in his own person, but in that of the Church, and of our Lord Jesus Christ.’

Two, if not all, of the three following collects, used after the anointing, pray expressly for the healing of the body:—

Rituale Romanum,
Ordo Extrem.
Unct.

‘Lord God Almighty, who hast spoken by thine Apostle James, saying: “Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over

¹ In a note at p. 226 of the ‘Eirenicon,’ the following quotation is given from ‘a catena’ to show, that, ‘in Victor, the efficacy is ascribed to the prayer’:—‘The oil, then, wherewith one is anointed, signifies both the mercy from God and the healing of the disease, and the illumining of the heart. *For that prayer worketh all is plain to everyone; but the oil is the symbol of these things.*’ The passage is from the Catena Aurea of St. Thomas Aquinas on St. Mark vi. 13, and it is there attributed to St. John Chrysostom; but critics say it is from Victor of Antioch. I subjoin the original:—‘Significat autem oleum unctionis Dei misericordiam, infirmitatis medelam, et cordis illuminationem; *quod totum oratio operatur.*’ The word *oratio* is evidently here used for the whole Sacrament. The italics are my own.

him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man : and the Lord shall raise him up : and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him :” cure, we beseech thee, O our Redeemer, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, the languors of this sick man ; heal his wounds, and forgive his sins : drive out from him all pains of mind and body, and mercifully restore to him full health, inwardly and outwardly, that, being recovered by the help of thy mercy, he may return to his former duties. Who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.’

‘ Regard, we beseech thee, O Lord, thy servant, N. exhausted under the infirmity of his body, and revive the soul which thou hast created ; that being amended by chastisements, he may perceive himself to be saved by thy remedy. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.’

‘ O holy Lord, Almighty Father, eternal God, who, by infusing the grace of thy blessing into sick bodies, dost preserve, by thy manifold goodness, the work of thy hands, graciously be present at the invocation of thy name, that, delivering thy servant from sickness, and bestowing health upon him, thou mayst raise him up by thy right hand, strengthen him by thy might, defend him by thy power, and restore him to thy Holy Church, with all desired prosperity. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.’

It is, then, evident, that the healing of the body, when God sees fit, is prominently regarded as one of the effects of Extreme Unction. But undoubtedly, as with all the sacraments, its primary end is spiritual ; nor can the words of St. James be restricted to the body. It is a healing balm for all spiritual wounds ; a celestial cordial for all spiritual languors. In the words of our English Catechism :—‘ It com-

forts the soul in her last agony, it remits sin, and also restores health when God sees it to be expedient.'

Practice
of the
Church.

Eirenicon, p. 219.

The Church's practice accords with her teaching. Her working clergy could produce instances in abundance, resembling the one quoted on the authority of a Russian Priest of a man raised up three times from dangerous illness by means of Extreme Unction.

Postponement
of the
Sacraments.

The Church, as may be seen above, urgently exhorts her children not to postpone the reception of Extreme Unction to the last moment of their lives. But we all know how often sick men will not own themselves in danger; and how the false kindness of friends conceals from them their peril, and shrinks from calling their attention to the necessity of preparation, whether as to their spiritual or even their temporal concerns. Thus, if the sacraments are too often delayed till the end, it is not through the fault of the Church or of her ministers, but it arises from the human weakness of so many of her individual children. Nor is this reluctance to contemplate the approach of death by any means peculiar to Catholics.

Custom
previous to
the
Council of Trent.
Eiren. p. 22

The 'Eirenicon' refers to an 'abuse before the Council of Trent, when Extreme Unction was customarily administered to those only, of whom there was a moral certainty that they could not recover; and, if they should recover, it was a question whether it should be again administered to them when they should again be sick.'

The 'Eirenicon' does not imply that this abuse

was in any way sanctioned by authority; but it may be questioned how far it had become 'customary' excepting with the ignorant. Certainly it would be manifestly contrary to the mind of the Church. It may be seen above how strongly it is condemned in the Roman Catechism; and the afore-cited decree of Pope Eugenius IV., a century before the Council of Trent, expressly taught, that the proper subject for extreme unction is 'a sick person for whose death there is apprehension (*de cujus morte timetur*).'

But, it is undoubtedly a fact, that the abuse of putting off this sacrament to the last, was too common at one time, amongst the more ignorant of the people. Benedict XIV. observes, that but a slight knowledge of ecclesiastical history will suffice to show, that the evil custom of putting off Extreme Unction till the very point of death, arose out of a false notion which pervaded Great Britain in the 13th century, that a sick person who recovered after receiving it, must afterwards lead a life of entire continence, even if married; and must never more eat flesh meat, or walk with naked feet (perhaps out of respect for the holy oil with which the feet had been anointed). He says elsewhere that this foolish idea seized upon many minds. It was productive of great evil; leading ignorant persons to postpone, and incur a risk of altogether losing, the Sacrament of Extreme Unction; as is stated in the decrees of the Synods of Worcester (*an.* 1240) and Exeter (*an.* 1287), both of which condemn the error as heresy. They speak also of

Hard. Acta Concil.
t. ix. col. 440.

Instit. Ecclesiast.
No. xxii.

De Synod. Dioces.
Lib. viii. cap. 7.

Hard. Acta Concil.
tom. vii.
col. 337 and 1081.

the twofold end of this sacrament, both for soul and body; and the last-named Synod further enjoins on parish priests to instruct their people that it may lawfully be repeated. Directions against the same error are found also in the Constitutions of Richard, Bishop of Salisbury, A.D. 1217. Later, there arose a foolish notion, that no one could make a will after having received Extreme Unction. This was condemned by a Belgian Synod, at Malines, A.D. 1607.

Quoted by
Bened. XIV.
in loco citato.

Hard. Acta Concil.
tom. x. col. 1746.

De Synod. Diœces.
Ubi supra.

‘In our own age,’ adds Benedict XIV., ‘the faithful are free from these prejudices, but nevertheless the enemy of man has instilled the notion into many ignorant and uncultivated minds, that there is an end of this life for any one who is anointed, and that the tomb alone remains for him.’ He then shows that one effect of the sacrament is to heal the body as well as the soul, if God sees it expedient; and concludes:— ‘Therefore the end of life, when he is now breathing his last, is not to be waited for for the anointing of the sick: for the sacrament does not work this effect by way of miracle, as would be necessary under those circumstances, but by a certain virtue—supernatural it is true, but in some sense ordinary—which assists the natural causes.’

Sum. Theol.
Pars. III. Tit. 14,
cap. viii.
He died
A.D. 1459.

St. Antoninus taught:—‘This sacrament (of Extreme Unction), when devoutly received, increases grace, which is the health of the soul; nay, it also sometimes removes the sickness of the body, gradually restoring its strength, when indeed it is decreed for any one to recover from sickness, and if such be profitable for the

salvation of his soul, which is principally to be sought for. But even if it should be decreed that they should die, yet death is not hastened by receiving this sacrament, as is thought by some foolish people. Nor ought it to be deferred till the last, when understanding and devotion are no longer possible.'

This is one with the doctrine of our own day. Thus, Father Perrone teaches, that, although Extreme Unction is for the grievously sick alone, it is not meant that it should be postponed till the very last. 'Such mode of acting,' he adds, 'is against the mind of the church, and contrary to the secondary end of the sacrament, which is to confer health, if expedient to the salvation of the soul. For since this sacrament does not produce this effect by way of miracle, it ought not to be deferred till a miracle may be necessary.'

*Prælect. Theolog.
de Extrem. Unct.
cap. ii. 43.
Ed. 31^{ma} Taur. et
Mediol. 1866.*

Benedict XIV. says that, towards the end of the eleventh and early part of the twelfth century, and even later, some were of opinion that Extreme Unction could not be repeated. On the other hand, there were those who thought that it might be repeated even during one and the same state of danger from illness. Sardagna, however, observes that it is uncertain whether the repetitions in question were not merely ceremonial. However this may be, Benedict XIV. states also that the usually received and approved doctrine was that which was afterwards infallibly confirmed by the Council of Trent—viz.

*The doctrine
on the
repetition of
this Sacrament.
De Synod. Dioces.
Lib. viii. cap. 8. iii.*

*Theol. Dogm.-Polem.
De Extrem. Unct.
No. 395.*

that Extreme Unction can be repeated if the sick should recover after receiving it, on the recurrence of 'another like danger of death.' The instruction in the Roman Ritual interprets this by the direction, that it cannot be repeated in the same illness unless it be one of long duration, in which the sick person after recovery shall relapse into danger of death.

The manner in which the subject was discussed by Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, shows that in his day (the twelfth century) there was a degree of doubt upon it (arising from a fear of disrespect to the sacrament). But he says that Extreme Unction 'is repeated often in nearly all the Church (*in omni pene Ecclesiâ sæpe repetitur*).' In the thirteenth century, St. Thomas taught precisely the same doctrine on this point as that which the Church confirmed at Trent in the sixteenth. He says:—

'No sacramental, or sacrament which has perpetual effect, ought to be repeated, because thus it would appear that the sacrament was not of sufficient efficacy for that end, and so a wrong would be done to that sacrament. But a sacrament which has an effect which is not perpetual, may be repeated without wrong to it, that the effect which is lost may be recovered by its repetition: and since the health of body and mind (*sanitas corporis et mentis*), which are the effects of this sacrament, may be lost after they have been wrought by the sacrament, therefore this sacrament may be repeated without any wrong to itself.'

Again he says:—

'This sacrament does not regard the sickness alone, but also the state of the sickness, because it ought only to be given to those sick persons, who, according to human

De Sacramento
Extremæ Unctionis.

IV. Lib. Sentent.
Dist. xxiii.

3^{tie} partis supple-
ment. q. xxxiii
In 1 Lib. Sentent.
dist. xxiii. q. ii.
art. 4.

Ibid.

judgment, appear to be drawing near to death. For some sicknesses are not lingering; so that if the sacrament is given in these cases, at the time that the person arrives at a state when he is in danger of death, he does not leave that state unless the sickness is cured, and so he ought not again to be anointed: but if he should suffer a relapse, it will be another attack of the sickness, and there can be another anointing. But some sicknesses are of long duration, as hectic fevers, and dropsy, and others of this sort; and in such diseases the unction should only be made when they appear to bring on danger of death; and if the person passes that point while the same sickness lasts, and is again reduced to a similar state by that sickness, he can again be anointed, because it is, as it were, another state of sickness, although it is not simply another sickness.'

Such was the doctrine of the Angelic Doctor; and it was that also of St. Bonaventure, styled the Seraphic Doctor, and of others; three centuries before the Council of Trent.

The 'Eirenicon' very reasonably asks for an explanation of the dogma that Extreme Unction 'remits sins;' it being a sacrament for persons in a state of grace, and not being 'given to remit venial sin.' Bellarmine also is quoted to show that theologians differ as to what is intended by 'remains of sin.'

Now the Canon defines that Extreme Unction remits sins, but it does not say, deadly sins; nor that the remission of sins, either venial or mortal, is the primary object for which it is given. All that is of faith is, that remission of sins is one of the effects of Extreme Unction. There is no question that a conscious state of mortal guilt is an obstacle to its

Sins remitted
by
Extreme Unction.

Eirenicon,
pp. 223-227.

Explanation.

graces. But it is commonly taught that it will remit even mortal sin in one invincibly ignorant of it, and otherwise properly disposed; or in one become incapable of any moral act, provided that, at the moment when he lost his mental faculties, he possessed that imperfect contrition which, *under such circumstances*, would suffice for this sacrament, but of itself, be insufficient for justification. It is unnecessary to discuss whether, under the pressure of sickness or mortal agony, even 'one of well-instructed conscience' might not be invincibly ignorant of a state of mortal sin. For many dying persons who receive the sacraments are, unhappily, without the habits of a well-instructed conscience.

Eiren. p. 224.

It is true that opinions differ as to how far such guilt appertains to the 'remains of sin,' and as to the mode in which the sacrament of Extreme Unction remits it; but this difference does not regard the dogma. Such points, says Benedict XIV., *curiose magis, quam utiliter, investigant Scholastici*.

De Synod. Diœces.
lib. viii. cap. 7.

The Roman Ritual expressly refuses Extreme Unction 'to the impenitent, to those who die in manifest mortal sin, to the excommunicated, and to the unbaptized.' 'Nothing,' says the Tridentine Catechism, 'is more opposed to the grace of this sacrament than the consciousness of any mortal sin.' Accordingly, if possible, it is invariably preceded by sacramental confession and absolution; and, by present custom, the Holy Eucharist is also previously administered. But these sacraments may have been defectively received; the sick man may have un-

Part ii. chap. 6.

consciously failed in the requisite dispositions ; or, through culpable ignorance, or even knowingly, he may have concealed some mortal sin, thus adding guilt to guilt. Or, strong temptation may have betrayed him into some mortal sin of thought, even after a good confession and communion. He may have subsequently lost his reason before he has made a sign ; but not before God's watchful mercy has aroused him (if only through the fear of judgment) to some degree of sorrow, together with hope of pardon, and resolution not to sin again. In short, his dispositions in themselves may be insufficient for justification, but such as to become sufficient through the grace of the sacrament. In which cases Extreme Unction remits guilt, supplies defects, and rescues the immortal soul from the jaws, as it were, of hell.

Again, a man's reason may fail utterly, or be suspended by delirium. An unforeseen accident or sudden fit may paralyze the senses and take away all consciousness. No confession can be made nor wish for absolution manifested. Eternity is at the door and mortal guilt is on the soul. But that same grace of attrition may have been in the heart when the moral action ceased ; and if God has seen it there, Extreme Unction will remit the guilt. Such is the case referred to, as follows, by Pope Benedict XIV. :—

‘ It is to be presumed of every one of the faithful, concerning whom the contrary is not manifest, that he would have sought this sacrament if he could. All, as it seems to us, should be fortified with Extreme Unction, who, being

De Synod. Dioces.
lib. viii. cap. vi. 6.

oppressed by the sudden force of disease, are deprived of their senses, and unable to signify any desire for the sacrament; and those especially whose known piety and faith afford an evident argument of their desire, which they would signify if they could. This practice indeed is approved by Instruct. Extr. Unct. St. Thomas, all the Rituals, &c., &c., and St. Charles P. 2. De Sacramentis, Borromeo.—Nay, Suarez observes that it is most necessary to assist such a sick person, deprived of his senses and incapable of the other sacraments, with the remedy of Extreme Unction: “Because,” he says, “one of the principal ends of this sacrament is to supply the place of the Sacrament of Penance, either when that cannot be applied, or when, in fact, it is not applied with sufficient utility.” On this account many theologians permit a priest to interrupt mass, in order to administer Extreme Unction to a sick person near to death, to whom no other sacrament could be given; because in such case, by Extreme Unction alone, if he have sufficient attrition, he can obtain the first grace of justification, which it is possible he may stand in need of.’

St. James v. 15.

It should be observed, that the words of the Tridentine decree, like those of St. James, are conditional:—‘If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.’

Remains of sin.

Theologians commonly understand by the ‘remains of sin,’ in the first place, the evil effects which sins have wrought upon the soul; such as mental languor, torpor, sadness, over-anxiety, trouble of conscience, blindness and deadness to spiritual things, dread of the world to come, weakness and inability to raise the mind to heaven, distrust of God, despondency, and the like; which are wont to oppress, and disturb, and enervate the spirit, and tempt the soul to despair, especially at the approach of death.

St. Alphonsus Liguori says:—‘Baptism and Penitance differ from Extreme Unction, inasmuch as they are instituted principally to blot out actual or original sin; but Extreme Unction (as St. Thomas teaches) is instituted principally to remove the remains of sins—namely, the debility and infirmity which remain from actual sin; but because the remains cannot be removed when sin is found in the soul unless the sin be first removed, therefore, as a consequence (*ex consequenti*), this sacrament takes away sin.’

Father Perrone explains the meaning of the term ‘remains of sin,’ as follows:—‘By this name is understood that languor and infirmity of the mental faculties, by which we are drawn away from doing right, and from the pursuit of virtue; as well as that perverse and preposterous inclination of the will, through which we have a propensity for vice, and are impelled, as it were by a kind of pressure, to the gratification of our passions. But the more hurtful this twofold affection of the mind, which is contracted from a multitude of sins, the more ought it to be healed by a seasonable remedy; especially when, being afflicted by grievous disease, there impends over us the danger of the loss of life. For we very much fear to die; and this fear is increased both by the consciousness of our past life, and by our anxiety and reflection concerning the dreadful judgment of God, shortly after to be undergone. Therefore, lest the mind should be overwhelmed with these fears, and that it may the rather expect death

Theol. Moral.
lib. vi.
Tract V. No. 731.

Prælect. Theolog.
De Extrem. Unct.
cap. ii. 45. Note 3,
Editio citata.

with tranquillity, it ought to be encouraged and raised up, filled with a certain pious and holy joy, and freed from the remains of sin.'

In lib. iv. Sent.
Dist. xxiii.
Q. 1, Art. 2.
3^{tie} partis supplem.
q. xxx.

St. Thomas says, that, 'as baptism is a certain spiritual regeneration, and penance a certain spiritual resuscitation, so extreme unction is a certain spiritual healing or medication (*quadam spiritualis sanatio, vel medicatio*);' and that, 'the principal effect of this sacrament is the remission of sins as regards the remains of sin, and, by way of consequence, as regards the guilt also, if it should find it.'

Theol. Dozm. Polem.
De Sacram.
Extrem. Unct.
No. 398.

It is important, however, to observe that it is not intended that the evil habits, engendered by past sins, are in such sense removed and taken away by Extreme Unction, as that the sick person, if he recover, need not fear any relapse into them; it is not (as has been explained by Sardagna) that this sacrament works any change in the natural habit and disposition of the body; but that it gives strength and vigour against the evil, and the remains of sin are taken away, inasmuch as the Holy Unction heals and gladdens and fortifies the soul, rendering it strong under its own weakness. It does not destroy existing habits, nor afford security against a relapse into evil practices; but it gives strength to overcome those habits and the difficulties and temptations which arise from them in the last decisive struggle.

In lib. iv. Sentent.
Dist. xxiii.
Q. 1, Art. 2.
3^{tie} partis supplem.
q. xxx.

Thus, St. Thomas adds:—'Dispositions remaining from acts, which are certain commenced habits, are not what are here called remains of sin, but a certain

spiritual debility existing in the mind itself, on the removal of which the mind cannot so easily be inclined to sins, even by the same habits and dispositions that remain.'

Bellarmino and some others understand, also, by 'remains of sin,' any actual sins which may remain after other sacraments, or be otherwise found upon the soul as previously explained, and which Extreme Unction (if received in proper dispositions) will remove, being, 'as it were, the complement of the Sa-

St. Charles Borromeo,
Instruct. Extrem.
Unct.

crament of Penance.' But this is simply a question of terms, since it is of faith that this sacrament 'remits sins,' whether considered as 'remains of sin' or not. Father Perrone says, that theologians everywhere teach that it remits venial sins *per se*; but deadly sins *secundario* or *per accidens*. He observes that it may 'truly be called, as it were, a medium between the sacraments of the living and the dead.'

In loc. cit. n. 2.

Ibidem,
49, ad fin.

The Roman Catechism thus beautifully explains the effects of Extreme Unction:—

Effects of
Extreme Unction.

'Pastors therefore will teach that by this sacrament is imparted grace that remits sins, and especially indeed lighter, or as they are commonly called, venial sins. For mortal sins are removed by the Sacrament of Penance; nor was this sacrament instituted primarily for the remission of heavier crimes; but only Baptism and Penance effect this by their proper power (*vi sua*).

Catech. Conc. Trid.
Pars II. cap. vi.

'Another advantage of the Sacred Unction is, that it liberates the soul from the languor and infirmity which it contracted through sins, and from all the other remains of sin. But the time to be considered most opportune for this cure is when we are afflicted with severe illness, and

Wisdom iv. 20.

danger to life impends. For it has been implanted by nature in man to dread no human visitation so much as death. But the recollection of our past sins greatly augments this dread, especially when the most poignant accusation of our conscience goads us; for, as it is written—"They shall come with fear at the thought of their sins, and their iniquities shall stand against them to convict them." Another source of vehement anguish is the anxious thought that we must soon after stand before the judgment seat of God, who will pass on us a sentence of strictest justice according to our deserts. It often happens that, struck with this terror, the faithful feel themselves wonderfully agitated. But nothing conduces more to a tranquil death than to cast off sadness, and await with a joyous mind the coming of our Lord, and to be ready willingly to surrender our deposit whensoever it shall be His will to demand it back. To free the minds of the faithful from this solicitude, and to fill the soul with pious and holy joy, is then an effect of the sacrament of Extreme Unction.

‘From it, moreover, we derive another advantage, which may justly be deemed the greatest of all. For although the enemy of the human race never ceases, whilst we live, to meditate our ruin and destruction, yet at no time does he more violently strain every nerve utterly to destroy us, and, if possible, deprive us of hope of Divine mercy, than when he sees the last day of life approach. Therefore are arms and strength supplied to the faithful through this sacrament by which they may be enabled both to break the violence and impetuosity of the adversary, and to fight bravely against him. For the spirit of the sick person is relieved and encouraged by the hope of the Divine goodness, strengthened by which he bears more lightly all the inconveniences of sickness, and eludes with greater ease the artifice and cunning of the devil, who lies in wait for his “heel.”

Gen. iii. 15.

‘Finally, the recovery of health, if indeed advantageous, is another effect of this sacrament. However, should

the sick not recover it in these days, that is to be attributed, not to any defect of the sacrament, but rather to the weaker faith of a great part of those who are anointed with the sacred oil, or by whom it is administered. For the Evangelist bears witness that the Lord "wrought not many miracles" amongst His own, "because of their unbelief." Although it may also be said with reason that the Christian religion, since it has struck its roots as it were more deeply in the minds of men, stands now less in need of the aid of miracles of this kind, than would seem to have been formerly necessary at the commencement of the rising Church. But, nevertheless, faith is here to be strongly excited; for, however it shall happen by God's counsel and will with regard to the health of the body, the faithful ought to rely on a sure hope of attaining, by virtue of this sacred oil, spiritual health; and of experiencing, should the hour of their departure from life be at hand, the fruit of that glorious assurance, by which it is written: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord!"

St. Matt. xiii. 58.

Apoc. xiv. 13.

St. Charles Borromeo teaches as follows:—

'The first benefit and effect of this sacrament is that it takes away the remains of sin, as if the complement of the Sacrament of Penance. Which remains are understood to be sins, whether mortal or venial, which remain after other sacraments; for it may happen that mortal sin may remain, the one who committed it being in ignorance of it, or not being able to confess: in blotting out which he is so assisted by this sacrament, that it may come to pass that a man is saved through this sacrament, who otherwise would have been damned.

Acta Eecles. Mediol.
p. iv.
Instruct. Extrem.
Unct.

'These remains are also torpor, grief, and a certain anxiety which is left from sin, and afflicts a man when close to death.

'There are many things besides which, in various ways, afflict a sick man; both the natural fear of death, and the

dread of God's judgment by which he is exceedingly alarmed, and the power of the disease, which so depresses him that at times he cannot take up the thoughts of God and of divine and heavenly things, and of the salvation of his soul. And it sometimes happens that, harassed by the disease, he is impelled hither and thither by some trifle, now to complainings, now to suspicions, now to impatience, and to other like perverse affections which hurt his soul.

'Against all these inconveniences also, this sacrament avails as a most wholesome medicine, and it is divinely endowed with power to enable the sufferer to bear them more easily.

'Another advantage of it is that, when the devil, who has learnt by daily practice the condition, the natural disposition, and the habits of the sick man, attacks him variously in all manner of ways in that his last hour, in order that he may distract him, disturb him by desperation, and despondency of mind, or exalt him with too much presumption and a certain elation; the sick person receives through this sacrament supplies of divine strength, which enable him boldly to resist the adversary.

'And, as it strengthens the soul against the enemy, so also, when profitable for the soul, it sometimes heals the body.'

The same holy bishop thus beautifully explains the matter and form of this sacrament :—

In loco citato.

'The organs of the senses are anointed with oil, because the soul is filled with the grace of the Holy Ghost, w^hich is commonly signified by oil, in order that sins and the remains of sins may be wiped away, and the soul raised up and strengthened.

'A form which contains a prayer is added, since St. James said, *Let them pray over them*, &c. And since this sacrament is a kind of complement of penance, and the sick, especially

at that time, cannot do works of penance, they expect remission from mercy only, which is implored by prayer.

‘The cross also is impressed when the anointing with the sacred oil is administered, in order that we may know that these gifts are granted to us through the merits of the cross and passion of the Lord; and that we may fortify our senses with that sign, and use it in the combat to be sustained against the adversary; and also that we may carry the sign of the cross to the tribunal of Christ our Judge, by which we may show that we have fought under the standard of the cross constantly even unto death.’

These pages would be incomplete without mention of the very clear teaching of the *eximius doctor*, Suarez. Resting on the spiritual sense of the words of St. James, and on the decrees of the Council of Trent, he says that Extreme Unction was instituted, *primarily*, to comfort and assist the souls of the sick against the difficulties which beset the hour of death, as wrestlers are anointed for the combat. He calls it the Sacrament of Hope, because it especially strengthens that virtue; he says that it also promotes cheerfulness, heals and fortifies the soul, and gives promptitude and vigour to overcome the temptations of the devil, then most grievous. He says that, *secondarily*, it was instituted to prepare the soul for glory, for which the removal of sin is most necessary. Therefore, that it will remit even mortal sin (where it finds the proper dispositions), not *per se*, as Baptism and Penance; nor yet altogether *per accidens*, as is probable with other sacraments, but because so intended by the Institutor under such circumstances.

Suarez
on
Extreme Unction.
De Sacramentis
Pars 2da. Disp. xli. 1.
Vide supra,
pp. 161-167.

The conditional form, ‘*If he be in sins*, they shall be forgiven him,’ shows that their remission was not intended to be the primary end of the sacrament; whilst the promise of forgiveness if sin be there, renders it evident that such remission is in some way peculiar to it, and in some way intended in its institution. He observes (in a previous paragraph), that the conditional ‘*if*’ indicates that this remission extends to mortal as well as venial sins, since hardly anyone can be found without the latter.—‘Herein,’ he adds, ‘is very greatly magnified the prudence and the anxiety of Christ our Lord concerning the everlasting salvation of mankind; for since eternity depends upon that moment, and a loss then incurred concerning eternal salvation is irreparable, and from many causes it may happen that either other remedies cannot be applied, or certainly that they may be applied without effect, therefore to this last remedy He imparted a virtue of its own (*proprium*) to supply this defect, and to rescue man when placed in so great peril.’

He says that Extreme Unction remits also the temporal punishment due to sin, not always entirely, as Baptism, but according to the disposition and devotion of the recipient. Also, that it removes other remains of sin; not that it takes away the *fomes*, or the evil habits, or the effects on the imagination, or changes the natural disposition of the body; but it gives strength and vigour, and in this way is instituted against the weakness left by sin,

not by removing it in itself, as it removes guilt or temporal punishment, but by adding more force to overcome it. 'It may also be said,' he continues, 'that it remits these remains, so far as, on account of his sin, it was due to the man to be left to his own frailty and weakness, and to be deprived of the helps of grace, especially of extraordinary and superabundant helps. This debt of sin is so discharged through this sacrament that, on account of it, these helps are the rather due to the man, to fortify him against such remains when he falls into that state of sickness.' He teaches that this grace belongs to the primary end of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, and that no other sacrament is ordained to convey it, since it is reserved for 'the special necessity and weakness of one who is sick.'

Subsequently he treats of the restoration of bodily health, when God sees fit, as another effect of Extreme Unction. Ubi supra, sect. 4.

Thus does this holy sacrament heal and sustain the soul, and, when expedient, bring back health to the body also. Thus does it wipe out any remaining guilt, if it finds the necessary sorrow. Thus does it bring grace to prevent relapse into sin, and to turn the sorest temptation into a source of highest triumph. Nay more—it wins for the sufferer merit and everlasting glory, even out of his past transgressions; by enabling him to overcome their bad effects, to hold on, and to fight his way to heaven, through the throng of phantasms and foul imaginations which

It is
a sacrament
of
special mercy.

rise up around him from their remains, like mists from the pit of hell. It inspires him with acts of the opposite virtues and of earnest hope in God—gems to adorn his future crown. So ingenious is the love of the Divine heart of Jesus, in repairing our losses, and increasing our reward—*Confitemini Domino, quoniam bonus: quoniam in sæculum misericordia ejus!*

Ps. cxvii.

Father Faber.
The Creator
and
the creature,
p. 304.

It has been beautifully said:—‘Death too, with its unknown necessities, must have a sacrament which it can call its own, as well to finish the demolition of sin, as to anoint the failing warrior with a heavenly unguent for his last dire combat, and enable him, in defiance of earthly calculations, to elude the hold which the unseen powers of evil lay upon him in that hour. If we ever need help, will it not be in that dreadful agony, for neither earthly love nor earthly power can help us then? With many, doubtless, the battle has gone hard, though they who stood around neither heard nor saw the mortal wrestle; and with many it was the secret strength of that holy oil, the hidden operation of that sacramental grace, which turned the scale, and consigned to the Good Shepherd’s arm that sheep which is now His own for ever.’

Lukewarmness
respecting
this Sacrament.

These, then, are the benefits of this most blessed sacrament of Extreme Unction. Who that believes in them, and is mindful of his last end, would not yearn for its Divine support in those moments of his agony when all support from man is failing fast, and

when Satan is near 'having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time?' Yet even the pious author of the 'Eirenicon' expresses no desire for it; he is neither 'cold nor hot' towards it; he thinks there need be no objection to it; and, in comparing Rome with England in this particular, he observes, that 'the only real difference is mainly practical in regard to the anointing of the sick.' But this practical difference involves the omission of a sacrament which sustains and perfects the just in their perseverance, and of which St. Charles Borromeo and others have affirmed, that a penitent sinner, in ignorance of his state of guilt, or not then able to confess, is by it 'so assisted in blotting out mortal sin, that it may come to pass that one is saved through this sacrament who would otherwise be damned.'

Eiren. p. 219.

Vide supra.

It is observed in the 'Eirenicon' that, if Extreme Unction be 'looked upon as a mere preparation for death, not as a means, if God so will, of restoring the sick, one does not see what there can be lacking to our dying,' if we have the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. Its author would never have said this if he had been one in the faith with Rome. It is true that Penance is ordained to absolve from sin, and that the Holy Eucharist contains the very fount and centre of all those graces, of which the other sacraments are the channels. But, even when both these sacraments have been received with the most perfect dispositions, who that believes what has been stated respecting that of Extreme Unction

Eiren. p. 223.
Difference as to
faith.

can at the same time question how it is lacking, for soul as well as body? Every sacrament has a spiritual end, peculiar to itself. They who believe that their Divine Redeemer mercifully instituted this one for their hour of greatest need, cannot neglect the gift without neglecting Him who gave it. It is one of the streams which flow from Calvary—one of the channels of His most precious Blood. It is one of the sacraments of the New Law, and the Council of Trent has pronounced ‘anathema’ against any who deny it to have been ‘instituted by Christ our Lord.’ Did He institute it to be laid aside, as if superfluous?

God’s mercy
never fails.

Isaias lxiii. 9.

Heb. ii. 3.

Deut. xxxiii. 27.

The mercy of our God and Saviour abides with us to the last. In the hour of death, as all through life, is the ‘angel of His presence’ ever near to save us. Well may the great Apostle call out, ‘How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?’ How shall men answer it before the judgment-seat of Christ, if they show themselves content to forfeit the aid of such a sacrament, which He has Himself ordained and purchased for them? In the days of helpless infancy, His ‘everlasting arms’ enfold us; and He makes us His by the grace of Holy Baptism ere yet our reason dawns. And when our reason’s light is failing, and our senses waxing dim, and death seems near at hand, again ‘the everlasting arms’ embrace us; again they sustain our second childhood’s weakness, through the holy sacrament of our anointing. All through our life they have been ‘underneath’ us;

He has 'carried us and lifted us up all our days'; and now in our last moments He 'is the same.' This sacrament fulfils and completes His promise,—'I have made you, and I will bear. I will carry and will save.' Again and again have Christ's sacraments restored, and quickened, and sustained us; but now, when our lifelong penance may be drawing to its close, and we seem close upon the threshold of 'the house of our eternity;' then in a more special manner our God draws near us, and His divine grace fortifies us in this sacrament of healing and of strengthening and of His own loving consummation of our imperfect penance. Our Jesus thus assists us that He may not lose our dearly-purchased souls; and that we may not lose our crown, then so close within our reach, if only we surmount that severest of our trials, on which depends—**ETERNITY!**

Can any Christian believe in this, who has it not, and yet say, without emotion, that he sees not what is lacking to his dying?

In the city of Rome, when (death seeming to be near) the Holy Unction has been given, the priest leaves behind him his stole on the bed of the sick person; and there it remains till the end, be it recovery, or be it the world to come. Thus is the sufferer cheered in his struggle, and taught to confide in the nearness of Christ, and in His love:—'Though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evils, for Thou art with me. Thy rod and thy staff, they have comforted me. Thou hast

Is. lxiii. 9.

Is. xlvi. 1.

Ibid.

Eccles. xii. 5.

Rome
is man's true
Mother.

Psalm xxii.

prepared a table before me, against them that afflict me. Thou hast anointed my head with oil; and my chalice, which inebriateth me, how goodly is it!

Which is it of the two—is it England or is it Rome—which proves herself man's mother in his hours of direst need? If England is of one faith with Rome as regards this sacrament, how can she explain or justify its three centuries' systematic cessation? Would not such neglect show contempt for it?

Holy Orders.

In reference to the sacrament of Holy Orders:—if England was of one faith with Rome, she would hardly remain so regardless of the fact already referred to, that Rome (who believes the repetition of Ordination to be a sacrilege) never fails unconditionally to ordain all Anglican clergy who come back to her, and who are admitted to her ministry. Thus Rome practically denies that the 'Church of England' possesses this sacrament.

Matrimony.

If the Established Church of England really believed, with Rome, that a true, ratified, and consummated Christian marriage is indissoluble, it is hardly credible that she would take so little pains to preserve her members from the iniquities of a Divorce Court. Had she believed such divorce a sin and had she acted as if she believed it, that Court could never have become established, when it did. But, after all, the Divorce Court was based on no principle that was new to her. She had already con-

sented to such divorces, and had invoked God's blessing on the subsequent so-called marriages of the divorced with other persons, whenever the civil power allowed it. The recent Act contained nothing new in principle, but it extended the existing evil, and gave a greater facility for the sin which had already been sanctioned. Thus, as regards the Sacrament of Holy Matrimony, again the two religions are found at variance.

To pass on.—If England believes with Rome ‘that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people’; why does she so neglect them? She makes no such provision for relieving penitent sinners from the temporal punishment still due after the eternal is remitted. She takes no pains to remove misunderstanding concerning them.

Indulgences.
See above, p. 161.

Again:—if the national Church of England ‘constantly holds,’ with Rome, ‘that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful,’ how comes it that she has no express and formal public prayers in their behalf? How comes it that, if such prayers are said at all, it is on sufferance? She takes no pains to recommend them; she hardly dares avow them.

Purgatory.

So also, as to the Communion of Saints. If England believes with Rome respecting it, how comes she to be

Invocation
of
Saints.

so remiss as never even to exhort her children to have recourse to the powerful intercession of the Saints who reign together with Christ?

Neglect
of these
means of grace.

Truly, if England's faith in all these portions of the creed still lives, her charity must be dead; she bears no witness to it in her works; she neglects these several means of grace; she never leads her perishing flocks to these many streams of living waters. Does she not scare them from drawing near?

Faith
respecting the
Blessed Virgin
Mary.

Where is England's separate witness to the one faith, as regards that sinless one, the most favoured and most exalted of all favoured and sublime creatures; her, whom all generations of the faithful hail as Blessed? England is not at one with Rome, nor with the great St. Austin, when he says:—'For the honour of the Lord, I will have no question at all entertained concerning the Holy Virgin Mary, when there is any discussion about sins.' *Exceptâ itaque sanctâ virgine Mariâ, de quâ propter honorem Domini nullam pro-
sus cùm de peccatis agitur, haberi volo questionem.*

De natura et gratia,
cap. xxxvi. n. 42.

The
Immaculate
Conception.

Scarce twenty years have fled, since the letters of the Roman Pontiff went forth over the whole earth, asking the testimony of every Bishop as to the traditional faith of his own particular diocese, respecting the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary:—Whether for one single moment, the great Mother of our God and Saviour had been under Satan's thralldom?—Whether there was ever one single instant, during which her blessed soul was defiled with Adam's sin?

The universal globe made answer; and the Supreme Pontiff, aided by the light of God, discerned the ‘mind of Christ,’ the divinely appointed moment, and the movement of the Holy Ghost.

1 Cor. ii. 16.

A vast assembly is convened at Rome, and around the great Apostle’s earthly resting-place large multitudes are thronging into the noblest of God’s temples. The solemn but joyful rites commence, and in measured cadence there swells up from that crowd of Christian men as if they had one only voice, the cry for aid from Heaven—‘Veni Creator Spiritus.’ It ceases, and all is still. Then arises in the strength of the Lord God, as if filled with that blessed Spirit, the holy and august Pontiff of old Rome, and he proclaims to the universe, by a power not his own, that after prayers and fastings, and earnest supplications from himself and the Church to Almighty God through Jesus Christ His Son, he now, assisted by the Holy Ghost, declares, that:—

‘To the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, to the dignity and glory of the Virgin Mother of God, to the exaltation of the Catholic Faith, and the increase of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and Our Own, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which maintains that the most blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her conception was, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in consideration of the merits of Christ Jesus, the Saviour of the human race, preserved

Litt. Apost.
de
Dogmat. Defin.
Imm. Conc. Virg. Decip.

exempt from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God, and therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any, which may God avert, shall presume to entertain in their hearts an opinion at variance with this doctrine which we define, be it known to such persons, and let them moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck concerning the faith, and have fallen off from the unity of the Church. . . .

‘Therefore, let no man infringe upon this our declaration, publication, and definition, or with rash daring oppose and contradict it. But if any one shall presume to attempt it, be it known to him that he will incur the indignation of the Omnipotent God, and of the blessed Peter and Paul, His Apostles.’

The Pontiff ceased, and the gorgeous vaults re-echoed with the *Te Deum* of thanksgiving from the thousands who were gathered under that stupendous dome. The strain was caught up outside; it was borne on throughout the universe; and the pure angelic vaults of heaven re-echoed the joy of Christian hearts below, that none amongst them now could have a doubt that God’s Mother was Immaculate; that their own Mother, Mary, was always without a stain.

What part has the so-called ‘Church of England’ taken in this triumphant hymn of praise resounding throughout all space? How has she borne her ‘separate witness’ to this article of the one faith?

Nay, what testimony does she give at all to the filial love and veneration due to Mary, which nature itself should teach to all who believe in their heart that of her 'was born Jesus,' and that Jesus is their God?

These are not idle questions; nor is it any idle motive which has induced me to explain these differences so fully. My object is to dispel the mischievous delusion which is raising a mist before the eyes of so many earnest Christians, and cheating into rest those who are in a position of schism and of heresy. I do not seek by these expressions to give offence, but I wish to call things what they are. I have shown, from authorities whose testimony cannot be questioned, the doctrine which Rome teaches to be the faith on the points which have been mentioned. She teaches it as the one only faith; the faith of the Apostles, 'once delivered to the saints.' She teaches it as the original revelation of the eternal God of Truth, through Christ 'the light of the world,' and through the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. She teaches that there is no salvation for those who wilfully reject this faith. If England accepts it, then why does she remain apart? Would not this alone be schism? If England rejects it, then in what sense can it be said that 'we bear separate witness still to the one faith which Christ gave to His Church, the faith of the creeds'?

I am prepared for the reply. It will be said that the points to which England objects are additions to

Importance
of these
considerations.

The theory
proved
to be false.

the one faith ; that they are not true explanations, but alterations of the creeds. Such an answer shows at once how fallacious is the theory of an imaginary objective unity, invisibly existing, through Christ the unseen Head. Can those be one in Christ, who are divided as to the interpretation of the articles of the saving faith which Christ revealed and taught ?

On this point I rejoice to be able to appeal to the testimony of Dr. Pusey. In his explanation of the theory before us, he teaches that it maintains unity of faith to be essential. He says distinctly,—‘ *They* have not the same Lord, who do not believe the same truth as to Him ’ ; and he shows that he intends by this, more than the faith respecting His Divine Person, since he refers to the Pelagians as not believing ‘ in what He wrought for us, and the Donatists ’ as denying ‘ the existence of that mystical body, whereof He was the Head.’

He proceeds :—‘ The faith, St. Paul says, is one, one unchangeable faith, admitting neither of enlargement nor diminution, so that either what the Apostles believed and taught the whole Church as faith, should cease to be faith, or that anything should become faith which they, full of the Holy Ghost, knew not and taught not as the faith. But since the faith is one, one whole, then whosoever parteth with, or altereth any portion of the one faith, in fact changes the whole, so that it is not the same faith, whence the stress in the Athanasian Creed on “ keeping the faith whole and undefiled.”’ He includes among those things which ‘ if any wilfully reject, they reject

Christ,' 'one common faith, that which was given once for all, with the anathema that we hold no doctrine at variance with it, although an angel from heaven were to preach it.'

Dr. Forbes asserts the same. He says that 'objective unity' 'requires, on our part, continuity of the commission which Christ gave to His Apostles, and perseverance in the faith which He committed to the Church.'

Vide sup. p. 70.

It has been seen that Rome teaches, as a portion of the faith, that Christ committed to the Apostle Peter, and his successors, the charge of the whole 'flock of God,' with supreme authority over the Universal Church; and that every baptized Christian owes 'true obedience to the Bishop of Rome' as 'Vicar of Jesus Christ.' England rejects this portion of the faith, and will not acknowledge this commission. What then becomes of unity between the two?

It has been shown further that, in other respects also, either Rome has added to the faith, or England has taken away from it. So that, according to the 'Eirenicon' itself, either one or the other has 'changed the whole faith,' and both 'cannot have the same Lord, who do not believe the same truth as to Him.'

Which of the two is right? Has England 'rejected Christ'? Or is Rome 'at variance with the faith'? Is there no one left on earth to teach infallibly what that one faith is, which 'Christ committed to the Church;' which 'the Apostles believed and taught;' and 'out of which no one can be saved'?

The Sacraments
may exist
outside
Christ's Church.

It is perfectly true as regards individual Christians that baptism made them one in Christ. On this very ground, as has been already stated, the one only Church lays claim to them all as her children. By whomsoever they may have been baptized, the Roman Catholic Church alone is the Church of their baptism and their spiritual Mother.

See above,
pp. 15, 16.

De Bapt.
contra
Donatistas,
Lib. iv. n. 1.

I venture to add another extract to those I have already produced from the works of that great Doctor, St. Augustine, on this subject. In reference to a passage in an Epistle of St. Cyprian's, he observes:—‘The comparison of the Church to Paradise is an indication to us that men can truly receive her baptism even outside her, but no man can either obtain or hold fast beatific salvation (*salutem beatitudinis*) outside her. For the rivers also from the fountain of Paradise flowed largely even outside it, as Scripture testifies. In fact, they are commemorated by name, and every one knows what lands they flow through, and that their streams have been established outside Paradise; yet neither in Mesopotamia nor in Egypt, whither those rivers reach, is there the felicity of life which is remembered in Paradise. Thus it comes to pass, that, though the water of Paradise is outside Paradise, still there is no beatitude excepting it be inside Paradise. So then, there may be the Baptism of the Church outside the Church, but the gift of a blessed life is nowhere found unless inside the Church (*sic ergo baptismus Ecclesie potest esse extra Ecclesiam, minus*

autem beatæ vitæ non nisi intra Ecclesiam reperitur): which also is founded on the rock, which has received the keys of binding and of loosing.'

The theory says that England and Rome are united in the faith and the holy sacraments. It has been above shown that the facts on both sides contradict it. But, even if England possessed the fulness of the faith, and the entirety of the sacraments; even this would afford no guarantee that she was united with the one Church. On this point also we have the authority of St. Augustine, who says that everything, except salvation, may be found outside the Church. The following passage, though frequently quoted, has never yet been answered:—'A man may have everything outside the Catholic Church, except salvation. He may have honour, he may have sacraments, he may sing Alleluia, he may answer Amen, he may hold the gospels, he may both have the faith and preach it in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but, nowhere except in the Catholic Church, will he be able to find salvation. For all these things pass away, my brethren.' *Extra Ecclesiam Catholicam totum potest præter salutem. Potest habere honorem, potest habere sacramentum, potest cantare Halleluia, potest respondere Amen, potest Evangelium tenere, potest in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti fidem et habere et prædicare: sed nusquam nisi in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ salutem poterit invenire. Transeunt enim omnia ista, fratres mei*

S. Aug. Sermo
ad Casarens.
Ecclesie Plebem, n. 6.
Tom. ix. p. 622.

Contra Litteras
Petiliani,
lib. ii. n. 126.

‘What can be more mad,’ he asks elsewhere, ‘than to communicate in the sacraments of the Lord, and not to communicate in the words of the Lord?’

There are certain religionists who profess union with Christ, although they deny the necessity of baptism and of any sacrament. The answer given by Anglicans in such case, will apply also to their own assertion, that they hold to Christ the Head although severed from His visible representative on earth. They acknowledge a visible church, and visible sacraments; yet they deny the necessity of visible unity. They profess that Christ Himself speaks and acts through a visible and external ministry for the teaching of the faithful, and the administration of the sacraments; but they will not believe that He has constituted one visible external head, through whom He rules and governs the whole body, as the crown of the Church’s hierarchy, and the centre of her unity. The Roman teaching is more consistent. It is as follows:—

See extract, above,
p. 74, and
Eirenicon, p. 55.

Catechism
of the
Council of Trent,
part i. ch. x.

‘Should any one object that the Church, content with one head and spouse, Jesus Christ, requires no other besides Him, the answer is at hand. For, as we have Christ the Lord not only the author of every one of the sacraments, but also their inward giver (for He it is that baptizes and that absolves, and yet He institutes men the external ministers of the sacraments); so has He placed over His Church, which He Himself rules by His indwelling Spirit, a man to be the vicar and minister of His power; for since a visible Church requires a visible head, therefore our Saviour constituted Peter head and pastor of the universal family of the faithful, when He entrusted to him

St. John xxi.

His sheep to be fed, in terms most full, so that He evidently willed that whoever should succeed him should have the same power of ruling and governing the whole Church.'

The theory which we have been discussing asserts the possibility of unity between Christian Churches without visible intercommunion; and maintains that religious bodies may be united to the Church through Christ above, although visibly disunited from the Vicar of Christ on earth. Thus it reverses the doctrine of the great St. Thomas, who says:— 'The unity of the Church consists in two things (*in duobus attenditur*), namely, in the mutual connection of the members of the Church with one another, or communication (*communicatione*): and again in the order of all the members of the Church towards one head, according to what is said, Col. ii.:— 'Puffed up by the sense of his flesh, and not holding the head, from which the whole body, by joints and bands being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God.' —But this Head is Christ Himself, whose Vicar in the Church is the Supreme Pontiff. And therefore they are pronounced to be schismatics who refuse to be under (*subesse*) the Supreme Pontiff, and who will not join the communion (*communicare*) of the members of the Church who are subject to him.'

Divine Providence is wont to select the simplest means for the attainment of its ends of wisdom; 'ordering all things sweetly.' The Church is composed of human elements, though animated by a

The theory
is
doubly fallacious.

Summa
2da 2da Q. 39, Art. I.

Wisdom viii. 1.

Divine Spirit. Her members and her ministers are men, not angels; and men are liable to differences and divisions.

Christ willed His Church's unity to be abiding; and He did not neglect to make provision for that end. He selected for her the organization best calculated to preserve her unity, and, with the help of divine grace, to ensure its unceasing maintenance. There can, ordinarily, be no lasting union amongst men without a supreme authority; and there is no reason why the Church should form an exception to this rule. The Church requires an interpreter, as Holy Scripture does; and Christ has not neglected to provide her with an ever-present final tribunal, whose judgment is decisive and infallible on all things which concern man's salvation. It is true she has her general councils. But who is to interpret their meaning on any disputed question respecting it, if there is no abiding supreme authority? Nay, who is to declare with certainty of any one particular council that it is ecumenical and duly represents the universal Church? To refer the solution of such points to another future council, is simply to postpone the difficulty. Who, in turn, is to interpret that future council's decisions? Who is to assure men that it is ecumenical? Take the instance of the addition of the words *filioque* to the Creed, and the question as to whether that addition was in opposition to the decrees of early councils. The Council of Florence defined that it was not so; and

the Popes had previously permitted it. Catholics regard this decision as the teaching of God ; for the Pope confirmed the council. But those who reject the Pope's authority, reject the council also ; and what can remain for them but private judgment and its natural consequences ? If men refuse obedience to a sovereign authority, they must accept the alternative of perpetual division and never-ending discord. Therefore, as St. Jerome says, although the Church is founded and solidly established on the Apostles collectively, who all received the keys, 'yet one amongst the twelve is chosen, that a head being constituted, occasion of schism may be removed.' *Tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio.*

Adv. Jovin. i. 26.

III.

Hæc est Ecclesia Romana, cui qui non communicat, hæreticus est. Illius interest consulere omnibus, judicare de omnibus, omnibus providere, ad quam in Petro vox ista dirigitur : Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

S. Aëlredi Serm. 23 in Isaiam.

The dissensions which at various times have arisen between different portions of the Catholic Church, are appealed to by Anglicans as precedents for the existing divisions of Christendom ; and as instances of the acknowledged subsistence of real though invisible unity, in the case of outwardly separated communions.

Historical instances.

Dr. Pusey observes :—

Eiren. p. 59.

‘No one, in the face of Church-history, can or does maintain that all interruptions of intercommunion destroy unity. For Church-history records too many such interruptions, which (although never probably without fault, on the one side or on both) yet did not exclude either side from the body of Christ. Unlove began its work even in Apostles’ times. At Corinth, already our Lord’s words, “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another,” were in a degree eclipsed. Divisions began within the single Church. In the next century was that first wider rent in the Christian body, when the Bishop of Rome, against the remonstrance of many Bishops, renounced the communion of the Asiatic Churches, because they followed, as to the keeping of Easter, a tradition different from that of Rome and of the other Churches. “The East,” says St. Epiphanius, “differing from the West, they received not from each other tokens of peace.” The strife ceased not until the Council of Nice.’

Adv. Har.
Lib. III. T. I. ix.

The instances
are not
analogous.

Undoubtedly there are various steps and degrees of dissension which fall short of an absolute breach of unity. But the existing rents of Christendom are far more serious in their nature, and amount to nothing less than absolute and consummated schism. It will be found on investigation, that the instances which are produced from history, do not afford authority for that systematic and persevering repudiation of the divinely constituted authority of the Roman See, which characterises the ‘Church of England;’ nor for her formal and lasting breach of communion with that universal body of the faithful which ‘acknowledges the Holy, Catholic,

See the Profession of
Faith, p. 161.

Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches ;' and renders 'true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.'

The local dissensions at Corinth involved no breach of communion with the universal Church. They continued, however, or were renewed after St. Paul had received his crown ; and it was to Rome that Corinth turned for succour. We learn this from the words of the reply of Pope St. Clement I., written in the name of the Roman Church ; where he explains the causes of delay in giving attention to 'those matters respecting which,' he says, 'they enquired, and to the abominable and unholy discord' which caused 'their honoured and well-known name to be greatly evil spoken of.' This is that celebrated epistle which of ancient practice used to be read in the church at Corinth ; and of which St. Irenæus tells us, that 'the Church which is in Rome wrote under Clement to the Corinthians most powerful letters, reconciling them in peace amongst themselves, renewing their faith, and announcing to them the tradition which she had recently received from the Apostles.'

The great Apostle and Evangelist St. John, survived St. Clement. Why did the Church of Corinth pass him by, and appeal to Rome ? He was the disciple 'whom Jesus loved ;' who leaned upon His bosom, and learnt from His sacred heart that lesson

Dissensions
at
Corinth.

Ep. Div. Clementis
ad
Corinthios i. 1.

Euseb. Hist. Eccles.
iv. 23.

Cont. Hæres. III. 3.

of love, which, even till he joined his Lord in glory, he never ceased repeating,—‘ Little children, love one another.’ Who more fit than he to teach that lesson to the divided church at Corinth? He was, moreover, the last of the long line of God’s inspired prophets, the eagle-sighted Seer to whom was revealed the great vision of the Apocalypse. He was the last remaining of the blessed twelve, the one sole Apostle left on earth. Yet it was not to him that Corinth turned in her distress; it was to Rome; to that church which Tertullian hailed as pre-eminently ‘happy, on which the Apostles have poured forth all their doctrine with their blood’ (*ista quam felix Ecclesia! cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt*); and with which St. Irenæus declared it to be ‘necessary for the whole Church to agree, on account of its more excellent pre-eminence.’ *Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potio-rem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.*

De Prescript. Heret.
xxxvi.

Cont. Hæc. III. 2.

St. Victor
and the
Asiatic Churches.

The degree to which the difference extended between St. Victor and the Churches of Asia Minor, is a well-known matter of discussion amongst ecclesiastical historians. Dr. Pusey appears to have over-rated it, and to have fallen into some inaccuracy. It is by no means certain that the Asiatic churches were even momentarily cut off by St. Victor from ecclesiastical communion; but the whole case affords remarkable and important testimony to the manifest

exercise, and the unquestioning acknowledgment of the power and authority of the Roman See, even at that early period (A.D. 198).

The Churches of Asia Minor retained down to that time, a peculiar custom—which had originated, perhaps, in tender consideration for the converts from Judaism—of celebrating the Pasch at the period of the Jewish Passover, being the 14th of the month Nisan, on whatever day of the week it might happen to fall; and they terminated their fasts on the same day, whether it was a Sunday or otherwise. When St. Polycarp visited Rome, this point was discussed between himself and Pope St. Anicetus, but without any definite conclusion; and that holy Pope is said to have tolerated the difference in discipline so far, as even to have permitted the Asiatics then resident in Rome to follow their own usage. This may have been through respect for the aged and great St. Polycarp, since the conversions from Judaism, at that period, were no longer so numerous as formerly amongst the additions to the Church.

But not many years afterwards there arose a manifest danger of the practice becoming confounded with the tenets of a party which had sprung up amongst the Ebionite heretics, and which maintained that it was incumbent upon Christians not only to keep their Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover, but also to continue the legal observance of the Passover itself; asserting, in opposition to the orthodox, that Christ had done so in person before He suffered. This

The grounds
of
the difference.

Goschler,
Diet. Theol. Cathol.
Art. Pâques.

evidently went beyond a mere difference in discipline; and, though it does not appear that the Asia Minor Churches can be accused of these Judaizing notions, yet it seems not improbable that an attempt was made to introduce them into Rome itself by one Blastus; a priest who had been educated in Asia. This Blastus was degraded from the sacerdotal functions by Pope St. Eleutherius, the immediate predecessor of St. Victor, for causing a schism in that city and attempting to Judaize (A.D. 180).

The conduct
of
St. Victor.

The early heresies were commonly connected with Judaism; and the Pope was probably apprehensive lest further toleration of the practice peculiar to Asia Minor might be productive of danger to the faith.

Ecclesiast. Histor.
lib. v. cap. 23.

Eusebius states that synods and assemblies of Bishops were held upon the subject, both in the East and in the West, and that (with the exception of Asia Minor) they were unanimous in their doctrine 'that the mystery of Our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's Day; and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the Paschal fasts.'

Eccel. Hist. v. 25.

Amongst the synodical Epistles to this effect still extant at his own time, Eusebius makes particular mention of one from the Bishops of Palestine, Theophilus of Cæsarea, Narcissus of Jerusalem, Cassius of Tyre, Clarus of Ptolemais, and others. He says that, after treating at length of the tradition concerning the Pasch, which had come down to them by

continuous succession from the Apostles, at the close of the Epistle, they added these words:—‘ Endeavour that copies of our epistle may be sent throughout the whole Church, that we may not have to answer for those who easily mislead their own souls. And we inform you that in Alexandria also, they observe the same day as we do; for letters are conveyed from us to them and from them to us, so that we celebrate the holy day with one mind and at one time.’

The immediate vicinity of these Bishops to Asia Minor gave them full opportunity for information, and it would appear from their language that they regarded the matter as of more serious import than an ordinary divergence in discipline.

It is also to be remarked that, although the same Bishops were desirous that copies of their Epistle should be sent ‘ throughout the whole Church,’ they did not address it to the faithful in general; but to one particular Church, or person, to whose central authority and jurisdiction they appealed to publish it universally. This can have been none other than the Church of Rome, presided over by St. Victor.

If the short account of this synod, appended to a treatise by St. Bede, is authentic, St. Victor sent authority (*direxit auctoritatem*) to Theophilus, by virtue of which he convoked the Bishops of his own and other provinces, and when all were assembled, he ‘ produced the authority of Pope Victor which had been sent to him, and explained the business which had been enjoined upon him: *protulit*

Recognition
of a
central authority.

De Pasche
celebratione liber,
sive
de equinoctio vernali.

auctoritatem ad se missam Victoris papæ, et quid sibi operis fuisset injunctum ostendit.

The Synod
of the Bishops
in
Asia Minor.

Eecl. Hist. v. 24.

As regards Asia Minor, there can be no question according to Eusebius, that the Synod held there under Polycrates was convoked in response to a communication from St. Victor. It is expressly declared in the synodical letter, which he records as addressed by Polycrates, in his own name and that of the other Bishops, 'to St. Victor and the Church of the city of Rome.' Polycrates says, towards its conclusion:—'I could mention also the names of the Bishops assembled, *whom you desired to be called together under me*, and whom I called'—*οὓς ὑμεῖς ἠξιώσατε¹ μετακληθῆναι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ μετεκαλεσάμεν.*

The letter
of
Polycrates.

Euseb. Eecl. Hist.
v. 24.

This Epistle was not calculated to allay the apprehensions of the Pope. It alone, amongst the many synodical letters on the subject, maintained not only the correctness but the duty of keeping Easter according to the day of the Jewish Passover, regardless of the Sunday. 'Not thoughtlessly, at all events,' wrote Polycrates, 'do we observe the day, neither adding nor taking away.' He appealed to those great lights who had gone before him, and affirmed that they 'all observed the Pasch on the fourteenth day, *according to the Gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith.*' He referred to seven of his relatives, who had been Bishops as well as himself, and who

¹ Valesius translates this word by '*petiistis*,' which does not give its full force. According to Liddell and Scott, its Latin equivalent would be *postulástis*.

always, he said, ‘observed the day, at the time when the people’ (i.e. the Jews) ‘put aside the leaven.’ ‘I therefore, brethren,’ he proceeds, ‘being sixty-five years in the Lord, and having conversed with the brethren from the whole world, and having gone through the whole of the Sacred Scriptures, am not alarmed at the things which are threatened; for greater than I have said, “We ought to obey God rather than man.”’—From such expressions it might naturally be inferred that these Asian Bishops looked upon the observance of their own custom as a matter of divine obligation. St. Victor appears to have regarded their letter in this light, for, according to Eusebius, he forthwith attempted (*πειρᾶται*) to cut off these Churches, as heterodox, from the common unity, and proclaimed by letters that they were excommunicated. But the same writer adds, that this was not pleasing to all the Bishops; and in particular he mentions St. Irenæus, who, writing in the name of those over whom he presided in Gaul, maintained that the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord ought to be kept only on the day of the Lord; but, at the same time, ‘becomingly (*προσηκούτως*) recommended to Victor not to cut off (*ὡς μὴ ἀποκόπτει*) whole churches of God, who observed the tradition of an ancient custom.’ Ecclesiastical historians are divided on the question as to whether St. Victor actually pronounced the excommunication; or whether he only threatened it; or whether he thought it sufficient to suspend, as St. Epiphanius says, the

Ubi supra.

εἰρηνικὰ or letters of peace between himself and the Asiatics, without fully excommunicating them.¹

Whatever may have been the nature and extent of the measures he adopted, we have here the recorded fact of a Roman Pontiff of the second century sending out letters to Asia Minor, and, as it would appear, to other Churches also, to convoke provincial councils on the question of the time of Easter; which councils were accordingly assembled, even amongst those who varied from the Roman practice on the point to be debated; and the reply of the same dissentient Bishops was duly returned to the Roman See. Nor does their reply afford the slightest symptom that they considered Rome to have assumed any undue pre-eminence, although it speaks of threats having been used towards them. It defends the disregard of those threats, not by calling in question the authority of the Roman See, but by appealing directly to the authority of God. The appeal was unjustifiable, and betrayed the obstinacy of the Asiatics in their adherence to private opinion; but it would have had no meaning unless addressed to a superior.

Neither do the Bishops who agreed with St. Victor, but deprecated extreme measures, seem to have expressed any doubt of the legitimate power of the Pope to excommunicate the Asiatic churches. Speaking in the name of himself and the Bishops of Gaul,

¹ There were degrees of excommunication which did not entail separation from the Church. See below, p. 311.

the great St. Irenæus tacitly acknowledges this power and authority as belonging to the See of Rome, by the very fact of his urging St. Victor to abstain from the exercise of it on this occasion.

The language of Eusebius in like manner indicates the exercise of supreme authority on the part of St. Victor, and does not in any way question the legitimacy of his conduct. That ancient historian appears to say, that St. Victor actually pronounced excommunication against the Asiatic churches, but was persuaded not to enforce it by the representations of St. Irenæus and others. He states that ‘he tried to cut them off, as heterodox, from the common unity’ (ἀποτέμνειν ὡς ἑτεροδόξους τῆς κοινῆς ἐνώσεως περιᾶται), and that he published letters ‘proclaiming them wholly excommunicated’ (ἀκοινωνήτους ἄρῶν πάντας τοὺς ἐκείσε ἀνακηρύσσων ἀλελφούς). Such a proceeding implied the consciousness of universal jurisdiction.

St. Jerome speaks of the same Pope as ‘ruling the Church,’ in the following passage:—‘Victor the Thirteenth’ (more usually counted as Fifteenth), ‘Bishop of the Roman city, who wrote on the question of Easter, and some other small works, ruled the Church (*rexit Ecclesiam*), under the Prince Severus, for ten years.’

Cardinal Orsi says it is commonly believed that, mainly through the efforts of St. Irenæus, peace was speedily re-established between St. Victor and the Asian Bishops; the Asiatics renouncing the error of

The language
of
Eusebius,
Ecc. Hist. v. 24.

De viris illustribus,
cap. xxxiv.

Result
of
the controversy.
Orsi,
Istoria Ecclesiast.
lib. v. 12.

regarding their custom as divinely instituted, and as prescribed by Christ in the Gospel; and St. Victor consenting to tolerate the different usage, as a matter of mere external discipline. He states that St. Anatolius, who flourished during the latter half of the succeeding (third) century, clearly ascribed to St. Irenæus the glory of having brought about this reconciliation. St. Anatolius says, further, that, up to his time, the Asians continued to observe Easter on the fourteenth moon after the vernal equinox.

He refers
to
Bucher.
de
doctr. temp.

About fifty years after St. Anatolius, it was stated in the Epistle of the Emperor Constantine respecting the Nicene Synod, that the observance of Easter was, at that time, the same in the Asian diocese as in Rome, Italy, Britain, &c., and Cilicia.

Eusebius
de
Vita Constantini,
lib. iii. cap. 19,
et
Theodoretii
Hist. Eccl.
I. 10.

Ep. de Synodis, n. 5,
Ad Afros Episc. n. 2.

On the other hand St. Athanasius in two of his writings speaks of the Cilicians as following the Jewish custom at the period of the Council, as well as the Syrians and people of Mesopotamia; and he says that the settlement of this question was one of the objects for which the Council of Nice was convoked.

But although the difference of custom continued down to that period, yet it did not then involve any interruption of communion, if such indeed was at any time the case. In addition to the above-mentioned St. Anatolius (who wrote about the year 276), we have earlier testimony as to what passed, in the well-known Epistle ascribed to Firmilian, so far as it may be relied upon. Those who appeal to that Epistle as an authority in the matter of St. Cyprian,

cannot consistently reject it in the present instance. It purports to have been written about the year 255, being fifty-seven years after the affair of St. Victor and the churches of Asia Minor, and seventy years previous to the Council of Nice which was celebrated A.D. 325. As an argument against the conduct of St. Stephen it asserts that, although there was a diversity between the practice of Rome and that of other places, ‘concerning the days of Pasch to be celebrated (*circa celebrandos dies Paschæ*) and many other things;’ ‘yet there was never, on that account, any departure from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church (*nec tamen propter hoc ab ecclesiæ catholicæ pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est*).’ It is true that the exaggerated and inaccurate language of the said Epistle, in general, renders its evidence very doubtful as regards historical facts; but it can hardly be maintained that Firmilian would have written thus, if any breach of unity had existed on the subject at the period when he wrote, which was nearer to the past times of St. Victor than to the then future Council of Nice.

The Council of Nice decided that Easter should always and everywhere be kept at the time then generally observed; that is to say, on the Sunday after the 14th day of the moon first following the vernal equinox, and not on the 14th day itself which was that of the Jewish Passover; so that, when the 14th fell upon a Sunday, the Christian Easter should be kept on the Sunday following. The point at issue

Op. D. Cypriani.
Ep. lxxxv.
Ed. Baluz. p. 144.

See Goshler,
Diet. Theol. Cathol.
Art. Pâques,
and
Diet. des Conciles,
Migne;
and particularly
Card. Pitru,
Appendix
in Tom. IV.
Spicilegii
Solesmensis.

Prolog. Paschal.
 Vide Petavii
 op. de
 Doct. Temp. Append.
 T. ii. p. 502.

had then become more complicated, through a difference in the mode of calculating the return of the proper period, and, according to St. Cyril of Alexandria, the Council decreed that the Church of Alexandria 'which excelled in astronomical science, should make known every year by letters to the Roman Church, the days of the calends or ides, according to which Easter should be celebrated; so that the Universal Church throughout the world might learn from Apostolic authority, without any disputing, the day that was fixed for the celebration of Easter.'—Here, again, we find a recognition of the Primacy of the Roman Church, and the title of Apostolic peculiarly applied to her.

But notwithstanding the authority of St. Cyril, it is very doubtful whether such a decree was ever made. For a long time after the Nicene Council, Rome and Alexandria differed in their astronomical calculation of the Paschal season, though perfectly agreed that Easter should be kept only on the Sunday following the 14th moon of the vernal equinox.

Such are the facts of the case of St. Victor and the Asiatics, which is appealed to in support of the theory of invisible unity.

St. Stephen,
 and
 St. Cyprian and
 Firmilian,
 Eiren. p. 59.

Dr. Pusey refers also to the discussions respecting the validity of Baptism when administered by heretics, with proper form and matter, which agitated the Church, and gave rise to serious though passing dissensions, in the third century.

There is more analogy between a thunderstorm which roars amongst the mountains, and an earthquake which severs continents; than there is between the few short years of the Cyprianic contest on a single undecided question, and the more than three centuries' fundamental rent which separates England from the Universal Church. It is most probable that St. Stephen never actually excommunicated the dissentients, though he seems to have threatened it. The letter ascribed to Firmilian appears to assert that he did so, but the inaccuracies of that document on other points, as well as its excited tone of language and its questionable authenticity, greatly diminish the value of its testimony.

St. Dionysius of Alexandria, writing to St. Sixtus II. (the immediate successor of St. Stephen), says that St. Stephen wrote 'concerning Helenus and Firmilian, and all those from Cilicia and Cappadocia, and Galatia, and all the adjoining nations, as *about to* refuse to communicate with them (*ὡς οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις κοινωνήσων*),' because they rebaptized heretics. This epistle has been only partially reproduced by Eusebius, but, so far as he has cited it in his history, it does not say whether St. Stephen afterwards actually pronounced the excommunication which it so distinctly states that he threatened against the innovators. It may, however, be inferred that the historian was not aware of his having done so, since he does not mention it when describing St. Stephen's sentiments. In a previous chapter respecting St.

Euseb. Eccl. Hist.
lib. vii. cap. 5.

Ibid. cap. 3.

Cyprian and the Bishops with him, who considered that converts from heresy ought not on any condition to be admitted before they were rebaptized, Eusebius mentions only that ‘Stephen, thinking that no innovation ought to be made contrary to the tradition which prevailed from ancient times, was *full of indignation* at this (ἐπὶ τούτῳ διηγανάκτει).’ He does not even hint at any interruption of outward communion.

This view agrees with the language of St. Augustine in reference to St. Stephen and St. Cyprian. He says that ‘Stephen thought that those were even to be excommunicated, who were endeavouring to overthrow the ancient custom concerning heretics who were to be received; but he (Cyprian), being moved by the difficulty of the question itself, and most largely endowed with the holy bowels of charity, thought that unity was to be preserved with those who were of a different opinion. So that, although angrily, but at the same time fraternally indignant, still the peace of Christ conquered in their hearts, that in such a dispute no evil of schism might arise between them.’ *Ita quamvis commotius sed tamen fraternè indignaretur, vicit tamen pax Christi in cordibus eorum, ut in tali disceptatione nullum inter eos malum schismatis oriretur.* Elsewhere he observes that, though it is not found on record that St. Cyprian corrected his opinion, yet it may not unsuitably be believed of such a man that he did correct it, and that perhaps the fact was suppressed by those persons who were too ready to take pleasure in his error, and

De Bapt. cont. Donat.
lib. v. cap. 25, n. 36.

Epist. xciii.
ad
Vincentium
Rogatistam,
nn. 38, 40.

who were unwilling to lose the patronage of one who was so great. There were not wanting those, he says, who maintained that St. Cyprian never held these opinions, but that the letters on the subject were forged and put forth as his, just as many things were forged in the names of the Apostles; and he adds that, in any case, either 'his opinion was other than has been said; or else he afterwards corrected it by the rule of truth; or else he entirely covered over this spot (so to speak) in his most pure breast, with the bosom of charity, whilst he most abundantly defended the unity of the Church which was increasing in all the world, and most perseveringly maintained the bond of peace. For it is written, *Charity covereth a multitude of sins.* There is to be added also, that as a most fruitful branch, if there was anything in him to be corrected, the Father purged him with the sickle of His passion. *For every branch, saith the Lord, that beareth fruit in Me, that one will my Father purge, that it may bring forth more fruit.* Whence, but that keeping fixed in the expansion of the vine, he deserted not the root of unity? For, though he should deliver his body to be burned, and not have charity, it would profit him nothing.'

1 St. Peter iv. 8.

St. John xv. 2.

1 Cor. xiii. 3.

St. Jerome says that 'those selfsame Bishops, who had decided with St. Cyprian that heretics were to be rebaptized, having returned to the ancient custom, sent forth a new decree.'

Dial. adv. Lucif. n. 23.

Our own Venerable Bede, though he does not give

Questionum Liber
n. 5.

his authority, states it as a fact that, through the abundance of his good works, St. Cyprian 'merited to be speedily corrected, and to be brought back to the universal law of Holy Church, by the instruction of spiritual men.'

Ep. lxxxvii. Ed. Baluz.
Paris, 1726.

It is evident from one of the Epistles of St. Cyprian, that he had communication through messengers with Rome, at the time of the persecution under Valerian, which commenced in the year 257 and in which the Pope, St. Stephen, as well as his successor, St. Sixtus II., suffered martyrdom.

A reference to dates will show that, if there was any suspension of communion at all between the Roman See and St. Cyprian, it can have been only of momentary duration. St. Stephen was elected Pope A.D. 253. St. Cyprian's friendly letter, urging him to depose Marcion of Arles, is placed by Tillemont A.D. 254. The quarrel does not appear to have then commenced. It is thought that St. Stephen gained his heavenly crown in the year 257, having been beheaded in his pontifical chair whilst celebrating the holy mysteries. St. Cyprian followed him A.D. 258, and, as Tillemont remarks, 'the Roman Church has always shown such great veneration for St. Cyprian, that there can be no doubt that he died in unity with her; not only through the disposition of his heart, but also through external communion.'

Hist. Ecclesiast.
tom. iv. p. 161.

He was martyred on the 14th of September, six years to a day after the Roman Pontiff, St. Cornelius.

The Roman Church delights to link St. Cyprian with St. Cornelius. Her martyrology names them together on their birthday to eternal life, and describes St. Cyprian as ‘most illustrious for learning and sanctity.’ The same pages again unite their names on the 16th of September, when the Church honours both in one festival, one mass, one office, and one collect. Side by side, too, have they been depicted by ancient piety in their sacerdotal vestments, and indicated by name in the Roman catacomb of St. Calixtus; and, in the most solemn canon of her mass, amongst the few illustrious Saints whose intercession before God is expressly invoked therein, daily does the Roman Church commemorate St. Cornelius and St. Cyprian.

De Rossi,
Roma Sotterranea
Christiana,
tom. i. (tav. vi.).
Roma, 1864.

The ‘Eirenicon’ speaks of the dissension as having arisen ‘through the Bishop of Rome, of whom one, now counted a saint, said,—“While thinking that all may be excommunicated by him, he excommunicated himself alone from all.”’ Did the learned author of that work forget that the Bishop of Rome, to whom he thus alludes, is himself enrolled amongst the saints?—that the Universal Church conformed to his judgment on the question?—and that his conduct affords one of the most striking amongst the numerous examples of the vigilance and the authority of the Roman See, from which even the great and holy St. Cyprian could not be exempted?

The letter
of
Firmilian.

The letter from which Dr. Pusey extracts this sentence has been alluded to already. It is ascribed to

Ed. Baluz.
Paris, 1726.

Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and it forms Epistle No. 75 in the works of St. Cyprian, by whom it is said to have been translated from the original Greek. Firmilian, its reputed author, was one of the most eminent men of his age. His memory is honoured in the Greek Menology, though his name has not been placed amongst the saints of the Roman Calendar. The Epistle in question is so utterly unworthy of his high reputation that it seems quite incredible he should have written it, or that the great St. Cyprian should have translated it. It appears, however, to be accepted as genuine by the majority of the learned; though others have maintained it to be a forgery of some Donatist, subsequent to the time of St. Augustine but in the same century. That great doctor never speaks of it, and it is argued that if it had then been extant, the Donatists could hardly have failed to have used it against him, as they used the Epistles on the same subject which are attributed to St. Cyprian. Nor is the letter mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria, though he speaks of Firmilian—nor by Eusebius—nor by St. Cyprian himself; and the Greek version, from which it is said to have been translated, has never been discovered. But, whoever compounded it, it is inaccurate as to facts, passionate as to temper, and, in language, exaggerated beyond bounds. Still, with all this, it bears testimony to the then existing claims of the Roman See. ‘I am justly indignant,’ says the writer, ‘at this so open and manifest folly of Stephen—that he who so glories in the place of his Episcopate, and contends

that he holds the succession of Peter upon whom the foundations of the Church have been laid, should bring in many other rocks, and should set up the new edifices of many churches, inasmuch as he maintains by his authority that baptism exists in them.'

The excited and unworthy tone of the letter may be perceived from the following passage, the concluding sentence of which has been deemed worthy of a place in the 'Eirenicon.' The words are addressed to the Roman Pontiff, St. Stephen:—'Thou fearest not,' so it runs, 'the judgment of God, giving testimony to heretics against the Church, though it is written: *A false witness shall not be unpunished.* Nay, thou art worse than all heretics. *Quin immo tu hereticis omnibus peior es.* For when many, having perceived their error, come from thence to thee, that they may accept the true light of the Church, thou helpest on the errors of those who come; and, having obscured the light of the Church's truth, thou addest to the darkness of heretical night. And when they confess themselves to be in sin and that they have no portion of grace, and that on this account they come to the Church, thou withdrawest from them the remission of sins which is given in baptism, whilst thou sayest that they are already baptized and that they have obtained the grace of the Church outside the Church. Nor dost thou understand that, when the day of judgment shall come, their souls are to be required at thy hand, who hast denied the drink of the Church to the thirsty, and hast been cause of death to those

Ibid. p. 150.

Prov. xix. 9.

who wished to live. And moreover thou art indignant. Behold with what ignorance (*imperitia*) thou darest to censure those who are striving for the truth against falsehood. For who ought with the more justice to be indignant against the other? Whether, indeed, he who joins with the enemies of God, or he who combines for the truth of the Church against him who joins the enemies of God? Unless it be manifest that the ignorant (*imperitos*) are also angry and passionate, whilst through want of prudence and of speech (*consilii et sermonis*) they are easily moved to anger, so that of none other more than of thee doth the divine scripture say: *A passionate man prepareth strifes, and an angry man heapeth up sins.* For how many strifes and dissensions hast thou prepared for the churches of the whole world? How great sin hast thou heaped up for thyself when thou hast separated thyself from so many flocks? For thou hast cut off thyself. Do not deceive thyself. If, indeed, he is truly schismatic who shall make himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For whilst thou thinkest that all can be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all.'

Prov. xxix. 22.

The letter contains other passages of like character, and it is from such unseemly railing against God's truth and its holy defender, that it has been sought to wrest a weapon against the authority of the Roman See; whereas the quotation in question, when taken with its context, bears witness to the existence of

that authority, at the period when it was written. The words would lose their force unless applied to a superior. It would be a meaningless truism to tell an ordinary bishop that he would cut himself alone off from unity if he excommunicated all others. Nor can it be supposed that St. Stephen would have threatened the excommunication of distant churches without a consciousness and certainty of unquestioned universal jurisdiction. It is to be remarked that the letter distinctly states that St. Stephen ‘thought he could excommunicate all.’ A few lines subsequently, it openly acknowledges his primacy; observing ironically, ‘how diligently Stephen has fulfilled the commands and wholesome admonitions of the Apostle, practising *in the first place* “humility and mildness” (*humilitatem sensus et lenitatem primo in loco servans*).’

Ephes. iv. 2.

Besides all this, looking merely to the historical fact of the respective numbers, the assertion was flagrantly false. It is notorious not only that St. Stephen did not stand alone, but that his doctrine was that of the vast majority of bishops.

Thus, St. Augustine speaks of the party of St. Cyprian, as some ‘fifty orientals, and seventy or a few more Africans, against many thousands of bishops, to whom this error was displeasing throughout the whole world.’ It is only the blindness of passion or the over-zeal of a forgerer, which can account for the hyperbolical assertion ascribed to Firmilian, that St. Stephen had cut himself off from all.

If all this be taken into account, and if it is remembered, further, that the doctrine of the Pope thus scandalously denounced as heretical, has been subsequently acknowledged by the Universal Church as an article of the faith; and that, on the other hand, the opinion defended by the writer of the letter ascribed to Firmilian has been rejected as heresy; it will not be difficult to estimate the actual value of that writer's angry exclamation against Pope St. Stephen, which has been brought forward as the saying of 'one now counted a Saint.'

The respect
due to
Firmilian.

The letter in question is not a saintly one, whoever may have been its author. Even saints whilst in this mortal life are liable to human weakness. The epistle stands self-condemned; but far be it from me to speak disparagingly of a Bishop whose name holds so high a place in the Church's annals, as that of the great Firmilian of Cappadocia. He is mentioned by St. Gregory of Nyssa as the early friend of St. Gregory the Wonder-worker, and as his companion in relinquishing the vain philosophy of the world for the true philosophy of the Cross. He says that Firmilian resembled him in disposition, 'as he showed by his after life when he was the ornament of the Church of the Cæsareans.' Eusebius mentions him first amongst the most eminent Eastern Bishops who were assembling at Antioch against the heresy of Paul of Samosata, when he fell sick upon the way and died at Tarsus about the year 269. The synodical letter of the same council, which is

De vita
S. Greg. Thaumaturgi.

Hist. Eccles. vii. 28.

Ibid. cap. 30.

addressed to Dionysius Bishop of the Roman city, to Maximus of Alexandria, and to the Universal Catholic Church, makes especial mention of Firmilian, as one of those whose presence had been solicited by letters. It says that he had twice before come to Antioch and condemned the novelty. It names him in company with St. Dionysius of Alexandria, and styles them together, 'men of blessed memory.' It is not probable that one thus spoken of in an epistle of such a nature, formally addressed to the Roman Pontiff and the whole Church, can have died out of visible communion with Rome.

As in the case of St. Victor and the Asiatics, the points on which the Cyprianic contest is appealed to by Dr. Pusey are involved in great obscurity, whilst the office which the providence of God has entrusted to the Roman See, is clearly illustrated thereby. Apart from that office, what was there in this matter to induce Rome to raise a voice of authority throughout Africa and the East? On what other ground were Africa and the East so disturbed by Rome's denunciation of their novelties? As regards his personal influence, who will compare St. Stephen to the great and the eloquent St. Cyprian? The error moreover was supported by Synods, and by Bishops illustrious for virtue, many of whom as well as St. Cyprian were afterwards found worthy of the martyr's crown; it rested on plausible arguments, and apparently just interpretations of Holy Scripture.

To human eyes it might seem, on the other hand,

Evidence
of
the office
of the
Roman See.

that the cause of truth was inadequately represented by the simple declaration of St. Stephen, in few but decided words condemning novelty, maintaining tradition, setting aside the opinion of St. Cyprian and of all the Bishops of his party throughout Africa, Asia, and the whole world, wherever they might profess it. But this simple declaration was the voice of Christ in His Vicar. In opposition to it, all the Synods, all the learning, all the eminence, all the holiness, all the plausible appeals to Scripture, even of Bishops like Cyprian, prove as nothing; they become as dreams; they add but another page to the history of human weakness, human error, and human impotence apart from God.

Rome instructs the nations. At times her word of truth may seem to lie dormant in men's hearts; but, like all that is divine, if its work is silent it is strong. As in the case before us, it is often found that those who at first oppose it, after a few brief years have passed, are brought to confess its power, and to proclaim that Rome's teaching is the word of the living God. Why does Rome prove always right, and Asia, Africa, Cyprian, Firmilian, and others who oppose her always wrong? It is not from any human super-excellence; not from any superior human talents; not from any greater human power. It is, because to Peter, and through him to Rome, and not to Carthage or to Asia, or elsewhere throughout the globe, was the command of Christ addressed:—'Feed my lambs, Feed my sheep;'

‘Strengthen and confirm thy brethren.’ It is because to Peter, and to none other, was it said :—*Ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non prævalébunt adversus eam.*

St. Matt. xvi. 18.

The universe has to learn its faith from Rome, because to Rome has its guardianship been entrusted by a power which is divine. Rome holds it not for herself alone, but for the good of the human race; therefore that divine power unceasingly assists her, and preserves her from unfaithfulness to the light and grace, which are superabundantly bestowed upon her for the fulfilment of her high commission.

St. Vincent of Lerins points to the conduct of St. Stephen in this matter, as one out of many examples afforded by those blessed ones who ‘shine, like the seven-branched candlestick with the sevenfold light of the Holy Spirit;’ examples which most plainly show to posterity how, in spite of vain words, the audacity of profane novelty may be trampled under foot by the authority of hallowed antiquity.—‘Such examples,’ he says, ‘abound; but, not to be tedious, let us fix on one, and that the rather from the Apostolic See, that all may perceive more clearly than the light, with how great strength, with how great zeal, with what earnest striving, the blessed succession of the blessed Apostles will always defend the integrity of the religion once received.’

Commonitorium.
A.D. 431.

‘At one time, then, Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, of venerable memory’ (a predecessor of St.

Circa A.D. 217.

Cyprian, in that See), ‘the first of all mortals, in contradiction to the divine canon, in contradiction to the rule of the Universal Church, in contradiction to the sentiments of all his fellow-priests, in contradiction to the custom and the institutions of ancestors, judged that baptism was to be repeated. Which presumption brought in so much evil as to have afforded, not only an example of sacrilege to all heretics, but also an occasion of error even to certain Catholics. When therefore, on all sides, every one was exclaiming against the novelty of the thing, and all Priests in all directions were resisting it, each one according to the measure of his zeal; then Pope Stephen, of blessed memory, who presided over the Apostolic See, withstood it, together indeed with the rest of his colleagues, but yet before the rest; esteeming it fitting, as I imagine, if he should surpass the others as much in the devotion of his faith, as he excelled them in the authority of his position. In short, in the letter which was then sent to Africa, he decreed (*sanxit*) in these words:—Let there be no innovation on what is handed down. *Nihil novandum, nisi quod traditum est.* For the holy and prudent man understood that the rule of piety admits of nothing else, except that all things should be consigned to the children with the same fidelity with which they have been received from the fathers; and that we ought not to lead religion where we will, but rather to follow wherever it may lead us; and that it belongs to Christian modesty and gravity,

not to hand down to posterity what is from ourselves, but to preserve entire those things which have been received by us from our ancestors. What, then, was the end of the whole business? What indeed, but the usual and accustomed end? Antiquity, forsooth, is maintained; novelty is rejected.'

The rescript of St. Stephen does not appear to have been intended by him as a definition of dogma, but as a practical rule to be followed under the existing circumstances. Such is the opinion of Cardinals Orsi and Bellarmine. The latter says that St. Stephen 'did not wish to make the matter itself of faith, without a General Council: but he wished only that in the meantime the ancient custom should be observed.'

The Council of Arles (A.D. 314), at which Cæcilianus of Carthage and several other African Bishops assisted, put forth a decree to the same effect as St. Stephen's rescript; viz. that converts from heresy were not to be rebaptized, but only receive imposition of hands, excepting in the case of defect in the essentials of their previous baptism. The Ecumenical Council of Nice (A.D. 325) practically confirmed this decree: for it made no allusion to baptism in its canon respecting the reception of converts from the Cathari; whereas in the case of the Paulianists (whose baptism was defective) it is enjoined, that they are by all means to be baptized when they come to the Church.

It would not be right to pass on without observing

De irreform. Rom.
Pont. judicio, l. iii. c. 4.
De summo Pontif.
Lib. iv. cap. 7, n. 10.

Conc. Nicen. can. 8.

Ibid. can. 19.

that there are authors, worthy of consideration, who maintain that the letters of St. Cyprian on this subject, as well as the letter of Firmilian, were forged by ancient heretics. Their opinion is not commonly accepted, but, as may be seen above, it existed even in the time of St. Augustine, who does not absolutely reject it, but says that he himself does not deny that such were the sentiments of St. Cyprian, for two reasons: first, because the style resembles his; and, secondly, because the letters attributed to him render the argument against the Donatists the more invincible by showing, that not even the reception of converts whom he considered as unbaptized, could induce St. Cyprian to separate from the Universal Church.

The said epistles have been appealed to as evidence that St. Cyprian was opposed to the claims of the Roman See. But the real sentiments of a writer are to be gathered from the habitual expression of his thoughts in moments of calm, rather than from occasional passages penned at a time of trial and strong excitement. The works of St. Cyprian, and even these very letters, afford undeniable testimony to his faith in the primacy of St. Peter and of St. Peter's successors at Rome. He observes to Quintus that

Vide supra, p. 227.

Ep. xciii.

ad

Vineent. Rogat. n. 39.

Epist. lxxi. ed. citat.

‘Peter whom the Lord elected first, and upon whom He built His Church (*Petrus, quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem edificavit ecclesiam suam*), when Paul afterwards contended with him respecting circumcision,’ did not arrogantly answer that ‘he

held the primacy (*se primatum tenere*) and ought rather to be yielded to by new disciples posterior to himself.—He writes to the Numidian Bishops:—

‘There is one baptism, and one Holy Ghost, and one Church, founded by Christ the Lord upon Peter, for the origin and rule of unity (*una ecclesia a Christo Domino super Petrum*¹ *origine unitatis et ratione fundata*).’—To Jubaianus, after observing that ‘it is manifest where and by whom remission of sins can be given,’ he proceeds:—‘For to Peter first upon whom He has built the Church, and whence he institutes and shows the origin of unity, the Lord gave this power that that should be loosed in heaven which he should have loosed on earth.’ *Nam Petro primùm Dominus, super quem ædificavit ecclesiam, et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit ut id solveretur in cœlis quod ille solvisset in terris.*

After thus specially distinguishing St. Peter, he passes on to say that after the resurrection also the power of remitting sins was conferred on the apostles. St. Cyprian seems to delight in bringing forward this prerogative of St. Peter as an attribute of the Church, even when it seems superfluous. Thus, in his book, ‘De Bono Patientiæ,’ in quoting the words of the

Ep. lxx. *ibid.*

Ep. lxxiii. *ibid.*

After thus specially distinguishing St. Peter, he passes on to say that after the resurrection also the power of remitting sins was conferred on the apostles. St.

St. John xx. 21–23.

Cyprian seems to delight in bringing forward this prerogative of St. Peter as an attribute of the Church, even when it seems superfluous. Thus, in his book,

‘De Bono Patientiæ,’ in quoting the words of the

Op. D. Cyp. p. 250,
ed. citata.

¹ Baluzius concludes from ancient authorities that the correct reading is here *Petrum*, and not *petram*, as in some editions (notes to St. Cyprian, p. 497). The meaning of the sentence would not however be affected by reading *petram*, since the terms are synonymous. The other quotations in the text testify abundantly that St. Cyprian believed and taught that the Church is founded upon Peter as the rock, and as the centre of unity.

beloved disciple, he gives him the simple appellation of 'John the Apostle,' but when he quotes St. Peter in the next sentence, he describes him as 'Peter, upon whom the Church is built by the judgment of the Lord.' *Item Petrus, super quem ecclesia Domini dignatione fundata est, in epistola sua ponit et dicit, &c.*

It is evident also that St. Cyprian did not regard these prerogatives as confined to the person of St. Peter alone, but that he considered them to be inherited by his successors in the Roman See; for he expressly speaks of the Roman Pontiffs as occupying the place of Peter. He says of Pope St. Cornelius, who succeeded St. Fabian, that he was elected 'when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter and the rank of the sacerdotal chair, was vacant.' *Cùm Fabiani locus, id est, cùm locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis, vacaret.* Elsewhere he speaks of those who 'dare to sail and to carry letters from schismatic and profane persons to the chair of Peter and to the principal Church, from whence the sacerdotal unity hath arisen, nor consider that they are Romans whose faith has been praised in the Apostle's preaching, to whom faithlessness cannot have access.' *Navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et prophanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos quorum fides apostolo prædicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum.*

Ep. lii. ed. citat.

Ep. lv. ed. citat.

Other well-known passages might be added from the same holy father, and, for the simple-minded, there needs no comment on them; but such as are guided by preconceived opinions will explain away the clearest language and the most patent facts. May God preserve us from eyes that see not, ears that hear not, and hearts that will not understand His voice!

During the latter half of the fourth century, the Catholics of Antioch were divided into two parties respecting the rival claims of St. Meletius and Paulinus to the episcopate of that important diocese. The title of Paulinus is said to have been preferred in the West, and that of St. Meletius in the East. It is a portion of history which is imperfectly known and which particularly demands attention, since the case of St. Meletius and his party is appealed to as furnishing a precedent for the separated position of the established Church of England, and as affording an instance of outwardly divided unity.

St. Meletius
and
the divisions in
Antioch.

It is unreservedly affirmed in the 'Eirenicon' that, 'St. Meletius out of communion with Rome, presided (as it were, marked out by God) at the second general council;' and that, 'when departed, he was owned to be a Saint by those who, in his lifetime, owned him not as a Bishop,'—alluding to Rome and the West.

Eiren. p. 60.

Dr. Forbes observes:—'Subjective unity was suspended during the schism at Antioch, yet objective unity is maintained; for the blessed Meletius is a Saint.'

See extract, above,
p. 70.

St. Meletius
enjoyed
Roman Catholic
communion
many years before
the
second general
council.

The schism in question was internal, and neither side was cut off, as is the case with England, from Rome and the universal church. There is undeniable proof that before the period of the second general council, St. Meletius was in formal and acknowledged 'communion with Rome;' nor can it be assumed that he was personally out of her communion, even when she demurred respecting his claims to the Bishopric of Antioch. It is notorious that after his early errors had been redeemed by his subsequent sufferings for religion and formal profession of the Nicene faith, for a long time before the second general council, St. Meletius enjoyed, and was known at Rome to be enjoying, the constant and intimate communion of St. Basil the Great and other eminent Catholic Bishops, without any interruption of their own acknowledged episcopal communion with the Roman See. This shows that, even at that time, St. Meletius was not out of communion with Rome.

It was never denied that Meletius was a Bishop. The only question at issue was whether he or Paulinus ought to be considered the rightful Bishop of Antioch. Rome never pronounced a formal judgment on the case, and her silence implied toleration. Rome and the whole Catholic world now venerate Meletius as a Saint, though Rome and the West, perhaps influenced by the great St. Athanasius, would not prefer his claims to those of Paulinus in respect to the See of Antioch. There is no evidence however that Meletius was ever condemned by Rome, or cut off by her

from ecclesiastical communion, or placed under any censure. It is not recorded that Rome remonstrated with any of the Eastern Catholic Bishops in consequence of their open espousal of his communion and advocacy of his claims. Rome received communications expressly from Meletius and other Bishops of his party, on the affairs of the East in general; nor did the Pope even reject the deacon of Meletius himself, who was sent to him upon that errand.

This miserable schism respecting the Bishopric of Antioch formed an exceptional case in an exceptional period. Great spiritual interests were at stake, and it was extremely difficult for those who were at a distance to obtain accurate information respecting the facts. It is not therefore surprising that the anomaly should have been tolerated for a while, and that the ecclesiastical law which forbade the co-existence of two Bishops in one diocese should have been looked upon as temporarily suspended through the necessities of the case. Such appears to have been the view which was taken. Rome ultimately assented to, and even seems to have recommended, a compromise, without any positive adjudication of the rival claims.

After explaining the commencement of the division, and briefly noticing one or two points in its after history, I shall produce incontrovertible evidence that the communion and ecclesiastical position of Meletius were distinctly recognised by Rome before the assembling of the second general council.

No argument
for the existence
of
outwardly divided
unity.

This exceptional and transitory period of the Church's history in Antioch does not afford any support to the present theory of an outwardly divided unity. It is true that the Catholics of that diocese were visibly divided within themselves, and outwardly separated into two parties. But, as has been said of St. Meletius, the members of both these parties were visibly and outwardly one with the universal church. Each of the divided Catholic parties of Antioch was in full and unquestioned outward communion with, at least, either the Eastern, or the Western, Bishops; and, though the difference of opinion may have produced, or increased, a degree of coldness between these Bishops, it did not occasion an interruption of their mutual, and visible, ecclesiastical communion. There is no reason to suppose that, after the promulgation of the indulgence accorded to the abjurors of Arianism, in the year 362, either Meletius or Paulinus, or any of their individual followers, were regarded on either side as cut off from Catholic communion, either in the West or in the East.

Vide infra,
pp. 282-284.

Both parties were represented in the one universal body. St. Basil upheld the claims of Meletius. St. Athanasius and St. Epiphanius befriended Paulinus. Yet these great fathers and doctors of the Church, along with many others who respectively preferred one or other of the differing Catholic sides at Antioch, were all the time united by the ties of a saintly friendship, as well as by the bonds of communion in the Church. In short, it is notorious that all the great

champions of the faith, and all the Catholic Bishops of the world, whether they respectively favoured Meletius or upheld Paulinus, were nevertheless in outward and visible communion both with each other and with Rome. This could not have been the case if either Meletius or Paulinus, or either of their respective parties, whether inside or outside of Antioch, had been out of the communion of Rome and the Universal Church.

The division between the Catholics of Antioch arose from local and internal differences. It was so to speak a family quarrel, deplorable in itself but separating neither side from the great paternal home. It bore no sort of resemblance to the subsequent schism of the Greeks; nor can it justly be pleaded as a precedent for the separation of the so-called Church of England from her parent stock and stem, and from the universal Christian family.

England is in a position of isolation excepting from the religious bodies of her own creation. She finds neither advocate nor defender in the whole of Catholic Christendom. England makes no appeal to Rome; England claims no communion with Rome; England's communion is rejected by every individual Bishop who is in communion with Rome; and no single member of the established English Church can be lawfully communicated with in sacred things, by any single individual of the faithful in communion with Rome. How different was the position of each of the Catholic parties at Antioch!

In the case of Antioch, there was internal division,

Contrast between
Antioch
and
England.

Isolation
of the
'Church of
England.'

Comparison.

but no severance from the *orbis terrarum*, and both sides looked up anxiously to Rome.

In the case of England, there is a notorious separation from the universal church, and an avowed rejection of the authority of the Roman See.

The grounds
of
dissension
are not
analogous.

Again, as regards the grounds of dissension, no analogy whatever exists between the two. In the sixteenth century, England cut herself off from Rome and the Universal Church, rejecting the authority of the Apostolic See, and adopting her own private interpretation of the Scriptures, and of the voice of primitive Christianity. This severance continues—and it *must* continue so long as England asserts the claim of an isolated independence. Such was not the case with any of the Catholics at Antioch. History does not record one single word or act by which either Meletius, or Paulinus, or any of their respective followers, ever called in question the supreme authority of Rome, or manifested any difference from her on any point of doctrine. Both these parties eagerly sought her favour; both proclaimed themselves in her communion. We are assured of the latter fact by St. Jerome, in one of his letters to Pope St. Damasus, asking for guidance under his perplexity.

Epist. xvi.
ed. Vallars, Veron.
1734, &c.
Vide infra, p. 326.

Nor was there any point of faith respecting which the Catholics of Antioch disagreed amongst themselves, or differed from Rome and the Universal Church. Their division was upon a question of rightful local jurisdiction, mixed up, no doubt, with

personal feeling on both sides. It was aggravated by the dispute respecting the number of the divine *Hypostases*, but in the case of the Antiochians this did not involve the faith. Meletius and his adherents employed the word to designate the divine *persons*, and consequently maintained that there were three. Paulinus and his party interpreted it of the divine *substance*, and therefore affirmed there was but one. The prevalence of the Sabellian and Arian heresies had given rise to this question respecting the most appropriate mode for the definition of one and the same truth. The two parties at Antioch differed upon that point, but, as regards actual Catholic doctrine, they were equally and alike orthodox, as is testified by Theodoret and others.

There is extant a contemporary sermon, preached by St. Gregory Nazianzen, at Constantinople, in the year 379, which bears witness to the unity of faith of the Catholics of that city, although they were divided into two parties respecting Meletius and Paulinus. It speaks also of the disposition of the heretics of the day to exaggerate the extent of the dissension. It may be presumed that, besides those of Constantinople to whom it was addressed, its remarks would apply to the Catholics of Antioch to whose pastors it refers, and whose division had been extended to Constantinople. Thus it further affords strong presumptive evidence, to say the least, in favour of the usually received opinion that a reconciliation had been effected in the same year between Meletius

S. Athanasii
Tomus ad
Antiochenenses.
See below.
pp. 288, 289.

Eecl. Hist. iii. 4.

Testimony
of
St. Gregory Nazianzen.

and Paulinus, though the contest was unhappily renewed by the partisans of the former immediately after his decease.

This St. Gregory—styled, pre-eminently, ‘The Theologian’—was an ardent lover of peace, which he described as a blessing extolled by all, but preserved by few. He eloquently bewailed its loss; more, he said, than Jacob bewailed the loss of Joseph, or David the death of his friend Jonathan, or that of Absalom his son. He greatly loved and admired Meletius, but his end and aim was peace; and when, at last, it was restored in Constantinople, he delivered the oration to be found in his works, under the title of ‘The Third Peace Discourse, on the agreement which we, of the same faith, made after the conflict.’

Ἐιρημικὸς γ’ εἰς τὴν σύμβασιν, ἣν μετὰ τὴν σύστασιν ἐποιήσαμεθα οἱ ὁμόδοξοι.

Oratio 22, i.

Orat. 23, iii. iv.
ed. Bencd. Paris,
1778.

‘We differed not,’ he says therein, ‘respecting the divine nature, but respecting goodly order.’ . . . ‘Concerning the divine nature, we no less consent and agree than does the Godhead with itself, if this be not a great thing to say.’ . . . ‘But there were matters upon which we differed. Nor will I deny that it was bad enough to quarrel even about them; for not any entrance or handle ought to be given to the wicked one, nor license to evil tongues; still, it was not so bad as it appears to those who traduce our conduct. For since, being men, we are liable to sin, our fault was that of loving our pastors to excess, and that we could not discover which of two good

men was the most to be preferred, until we agreed to admire them both alike. This is the complaint against us. Let anyone who pleases censure or acquit us on these points. This is the security of the heretics — τοῦτο τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἡ ἀσφάλεια. But, however much you may desire it, besides this there is nothing. “Dead and rotten flies,” saith the preacher, “make oil to stink;” and envy will try to give an ill savour to things that are good, but it will not be able. For, as appears to Esdras and to me, “the strongest of all things is truth.”

Eccles. x. 1.

The seeds of the schism between the Catholics of Antioch were sown by the impiety of the Arians.

The origin
of
the schism.

St. Vincent of Lerins observes that ‘the profane novelty of Arianism, like some Bellona or Fury, having first taken captive the Emperor, and then subjugated all the highest posts of the palace to its new laws, from thenceforth never ceased to confound and disturb all things, private and public, sacred and profane; to show no distinction towards what was good and true, but to smite whomsoever it would, as if from a higher region.’—An exemption from this fiery trial could hardly be expected in the case of the third ecclesiastical city of Christendom, peculiarly hateful to the devil, as is observed by St. Basil, because it was the birthplace of the name of Christian.

Commonitorium,
propè principium.

Epist. cclviii.
Epiphanius episc.

No sooner had the Arians been condemned in the great council of Nicæa than they formed the iniquitous design of intruding the favourers of their

heresy into the sees of the Catholic bishops, wherever they could devise the means. Their first efforts were directed against St. Eustathius, who had distinguished himself as one of the earliest and most vigorous of their opponents, and who at that time occupied the aforesaid very eminent and important see of Antioch. About the year 330, Eusebius of Nicomedia, with others of that party, assembled a conciliabule at Antioch, in which they unlawfully obtained the deposition of Eustathius by means of false and shameful accusations, supported, in part, by a suborned witness, who afterwards openly confessed her guilt. They maligned him to the Emperor, and obtained his banishment into a distant country. One of their own bishops was then thrust into his place, and for a period of thirty years the great episcopal chair of Antioch continued in the undisturbed possession of a series of Arian or Eusebian prelates. Eudoxius, of unhappy memory, belonged to this line of bishops. Having left, or been expelled from, the see of Antioch, he obtained that of Constantinople, A.D. 359, or early in the year 360.

Theodoret relates that the Emperor Constantius afterwards called together the bishops, enforcing the universal rejection of both the extreme terms—*homoousion* and *heterousion* (*ἀρνηθῆναι πάντας καὶ τὸ ὁμοούσιον ἀναγκάζων καὶ τὸ ἕτεροούσιον*). He says, that many bishops being thus assembled from various provinces, they proposed in the first place to provide a pastor for the see of Antioch, and that, through

Theodoret Hist. Eccl. lib. i. 21, ii. 31.
Socratis Hist. Eccl. lib. i. 24.
Sozomeni Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. 19.

Election
of
Melchius.

Theod. ii. 31.
Socrat. ii. 44.
Sozom. iv. 28.

the influence of the Arians, though with the concurrence of certain of the orthodox, Meletius was accordingly elected to fill the place left vacant by Eudoxius.

Meletius came originally from Melitine, in the Lesser Armenia, and it appears that he was of noble birth, and in the possession of an estate. According to the general opinion amongst writers of authority, he was first consecrated bishop to the see of Sebaste, in Armenia;¹ but being unable to endure the unruliness of the people, he had found repose in the city of Berœa in Syria, where he was residing when summoned to the ecclesiastical throne of Antioch.

There cannot be any question that, during his earlier life, Meletius was intimately connected with the Arian faction, though it is uncertain to what extent he was involved in their errors. Even his warm-spoken panegyrist, St. Gregory Nazianzen, is compelled to interrupt the strain of his praises in order to acknowledge, in a parenthesis, that ‘to a slight extent he was led astray by the stranger’s hand.’

Carmen de vitâ suâ,
v. 1523. t. ii. p. 754,
ed. Paris, 1840.

εἰ καὶ ξένη τι μικρὸν ἐκλάπη, χερί.

But this remark would apply only to the earlier part of his career, and not to the period after his election to the bishopric of Antioch, during which he boldly confessed, and suffered for, the faith.

¹ Baronius (an. 360, n. 48) seems to suggest that Meletius may have been translated from Berœa to Sebaste, but there is not sufficient ground for such a supposition. See Valesius, *Annot. in Socrat. lib. ii. c. 44*; and Tillemont, note iii. sur S. Melèce.

- Eccles. Hist. v. 1. 5. The Arian historian Philostorgius, says that Meletius at one time ‘feignedly professed the *heterousion*’
- Hist. Eccl. ii. 44. (τὸ ἑτερούσιον ὑπεκρίνετο). According to Socrates, Meletius was present at the conciliabule of Seleucia, and signed the Arian and semi-Arian profession of faith therein put forth by the Acacians. But though
- Hæres. lxxiii. 25, 26. the said document is recorded by St. Epiphanius, with the signatures of forty-three bishops, that of Meletius does not appear amongst them, nor is it certain whether he was at that time a bishop at all.
- Ibid. 27, 28. St. Epiphanius, however, mentions him as belonging to the party of Acacius, which he numbers amongst those whose ‘whole work was full of fraud.’ He also states that Meletius was made bishop of Antioch by Acacius and his party, and that they considered him at the time to be of the same opinion as themselves.

It is certain that before his elevation to the see of Antioch, Meletius had done nothing openly in defence of the truth, even if he had taken no active part against it; and though he may never have committed himself to any overt profession of heresy, yet, if he was always a Catholic at heart, he must have been guilty in his earlier career of culpable indulgence towards error, and of unworthy dissimulation respecting his actual sentiments. This is manifest from the fact that the Arians universally accounted him as their own, until after the period of his election to the see of Antioch. According to Nic

the see of Sebaste, was owing to the suffrages of the Arians. This statement may have been derived from Sozomen, who, in mentioning certain appointments that were made by the extreme Arian party, called after their leader, *Eudorians*, includes as one of them that of Meletius to the rule of the church of Sebaste.

Hist. Eccl. iv. 25.

There can be no doubt that Meletius was at that time commonly reputed to be an Arian, both in doctrine and communion, and that he was elevated to the episcopal chair of Antioch through the combined influence of the different sections of Arianism. St. Epiphanius, as above mentioned, attributes his said elevation to the semi-Arian Acacius and his party. Philostorgius also recounts it as the work of Acacius, observing, in the bitterness of his own more extreme heresy, that Acacius endeavoured everywhere to appoint those who professed the doctrine of the consubstantiality. Sozomen attributes the election of Meletius as bishop of Antioch to the Eudoxians, who, he says, first placed him at Sebaste, and to whom, he says, 'it seemed well to transfer Meletius from Sebaste to Antioch, as one who was skilful in speech and in powers of persuasion, good in his manner of life, and hitherto of their own way of thinking. For they altogether hoped by the estimation of the man to entrap into their own heresy the inhabitants of Antioch and the cities round about, and especially those who were called Eustathians, whose doctrine respecting God was according to the tradition in the synod of Nicæa.' St. Jerome records in his Chronicle

In loco citato.

Hist. Eccl. iv. 25, 28.

S. Hieron. Op. omn.
t. viii. p. 805,
ed. Vallars.
Veron. 1740.

that 'Meletius, Bishop of Sebaste, in Armenia, was transferred to Antioch by the Arian Bishops Acacius and George.' The George here mentioned was probably the extreme Arian bishop of Laodicæa.

Thus, though certain Catholic bishops concurred in this election of Meletius, it cannot be denied that, in itself, it was essentially the act of the Arians, who in like manner ejected him at once when he professed the Catholic doctrine. The Catholics were powerless in both instances.

Theodoret is the only one of the early ecclesiastical historians who mentions the concurrence of any of the Catholics, and the only name which he has recorded amongst them, is that of St. Eusebius of Samosata. Father Bollandus, who is himself the author of the 'Life of St. Meletius,' in the work through which his own name has become immortalized, says that St. Eusebius of Samosata attended the assemblies of the heterodox, in order to rescue from heresy any he might be able to rescue, especially such as had fallen rather through ignorance than through malice. He observes that the same St. Eusebius may have been instrumental in the conversion of Meletius.

Bolland
Acta Sanctorum,
Feb. xii.

Friendly and direct intercourse must undoubtedly have taken place between Meletius and the Catholics referred to, for they were aware of his orthodoxy; at the same time, it is evident that the change which had been effected in him was kept as a secret, for if the Arians had known of it, they would unquestion-

ably have selected some other person as the successor of Eudoxius in Antioch. The transaction is thus related in the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Theodoret:—

Lib. ii. 31.

'At that time the divine Meletius, bishop of some city in Armenia, being subsequently unable to bear the contumacy of his flock, was living elsewhere in repose. The Arians, surmising (*ὑποτοπήσαντες*) that he was of one mind with their party, besought Constantius to commit to him the government of the see of Antioch. For, without any restraint, they violated every law, in their endeavours to strengthen their impiety; and the transgression of the laws was the foundation of their blasphemy; and many such innovations they made in many places.¹ But the maintainers of the Apostolic dogmata, both being aware of the soundness in doctrine of the great Meletius, and of course being well acquainted with his holiness of life and richness in virtue, voted with the others, and took the greatest possible care that the act should be written out, and that it should be signed by all; and both one side and the other delivered it as a sort

¹ The essential flaw in the title of Meletius to the see of Antioch was the fact of his having been elected by the Arians, and that as a partaker of their communion. But since the Arians themselves would not account this to be any fault, it is not easy to see in what sense it is implied by Theodoret that they conscientiously violated the Church's laws in this particular instance. Perhaps he considered them to blame for requesting the interference of the emperor; or he may have intended to allude to the translation (if such it really was) of Meletius from Sebaste to Antioch, which seems to have been one of the charges against him. See Tillemont, Hist. Eccl., note iv. sur S. Melèce.

of mutual compact to the custody of Eusebius, the bishop of the Samosatians, a noble man, a contender for the truth.'

Theod.
Ecel. Hist. ii. 32.

When Meletius afterwards declared himself a Catholic, the Arians persuaded the emperor to despatch a messenger in hot haste for the surrender of this document. But St. Eusebius would not give it up, and when threatened, through a second messenger, with the loss of his right hand if he persisted, he held out both his hands to be cut off, repeating his refusal to abandon it. The threat was only intended to terrify, and it was not put into execution. But the firmness of the heroic and faithful bishop excited the admiration of the heretical emperor.

However excellent may have been the motives of these Catholic bishops, they appear to have acted, on this occasion, without any sufficient authority; and their zeal for the advancement of the faith seems to have betrayed them into unlawful communication with the promoters and propagators of heresy. The majority of the Catholics of Antioch exhibited a similar laxity, by mixing in the Arian assemblies, though they did not adopt the Arian tenets. This party raised no objection to the election of Meletius, although the subordinate co-operation in that act of the aforesaid Catholic bishops was insufficient to efface the brand of Arianism, which rendered it invalid in the eyes of the Church.

The Ecclesiastical

There was, however, an important section of the

faithful in Antioch who would not consent to acknowledge Meletius as their lawful bishop, on account of his connection with the Arians. This party was the only one in the city whose conduct appears to have been in strict accordance with the Church's laws. It was in fact the old Catholic party, and consistent in its line of action as such. It was steadfast in its rejection of the communion of the Arian prelates and their followers, and in its adherence to the rightful claims of the exiled St. Eustathius. Hence this faithful body of Catholics acquired the appellation of *Eustathians*, though totally unconnected with the sect so called after another Bishop Eustathius, of Sebaste. During the thirty years which had elapsed from the period of the unlawful deposition of St. Eustathius of Antioch, to that of the elevation of Meletius to the same see, too many of the Catholics in the city had so far conformed to the altered state of things as to unite with the Arians in their public worship, though Sozomen relates that, whilst they sang psalms together with the Arians, they asserted the Catholic doctrine in the concluding doxology; the others in the same manner giving utterance to their heresy. 'Being arranged,' he says, 'in choirs, as was the custom in singing to God, at the end of the hymns they showed forth their particular opinions. The one party gave glory to Father and Son, as worthy of equal honour; but the other gave glory to the Father in the Son, denoting, by the insertion of the preposition, that

Hist. Eccl. iii. 20.

the Son was inferior to the Father.' The Eustathians would not consent to this species of union without unity. They withstood the seducing influences of an accomplished fact, and, remaining true to their principles, they altogether refused to follow the other Catholics into the churches thus occupied by the Arians. Though a minority, they were numerous and united; and they persevered with an admirable constancy in holding aloof from all communion with the intruded line of bishops, and consequently from Meletius, who formed one of that line, and who owed his election to the authors of it.

Twenty-three years had elapsed since the death of St. Eustathius, when Meletius was elected to Antioch, A.D. 361. It is generally considered that Eustathius died in exile certainly not later than the year 338, but the commonly assigned date is A.D. 337.¹ No successor had been appointed to him as the Catholic bishop of Antioch, but Paulinus was universally recognised to be the leader of the Eustathians, although not elevated above the priesthood for a few

¹ There seems to be no doubt that Soerates (iv. 14.) and Sozomen (vi. 13.) are mistaken in representing St. Eustathius to have been alive, and in Constantinople, at the period of the death of Eudoxius, A.D. 370. They probably confounded him with another Eustathius. Theodoret states positively (iii. 4.) that St. Eustathius of Antioch was dead before the ordination of Meletius, and though the precise date of his decease has not been ascertained, there are sufficient grounds for concluding that it cannot have occurred later than during the year 338. See Tillemont, note v. sur S. Eustathe; Valesius, not. in Soerat. iv. 14; Bolland. Acta Sanct. Jul. xvi.

years subsequent to the election of Meletius. He had received his ordination as priest through the hands of St. Eustathius. His doctrine was unimpeachable, his character was exemplary, and his conduct was untainted by any communion with heretics. He enjoyed the confidence and protection of St. Athanasius, who adhered constantly to his communion and that of the Catholics under his guidance.

When St. Athanasius went to Antioch in the year 349, to meet the Emperor Constantius, who had recalled him from exile, he would have no religious communication with the Arian bishop Leontius, nor with that section of the Catholics who assembled with the Arians in his churches; but he united in communion with the Eustathians, who at that time held their religious assemblies in private houses, and he endeavoured to obtain for them a separate church. It is related that the Arians persuaded the emperor to request St. Athanasius to give up one of the churches of Alexandria to themselves, since they objected to hold communion with him, and that the Saint in wisdom replied, that no one could resist the commands of the emperor, but that in return he had himself to make the petition that one of the churches in Antioch, and, according to Socrates, in every other city also, should be given up for the use of those who objected to communicate with the Arians. Constantius was disposed to assent, but the Arians, perceiving that such an arrangement would not be for their own advantage, preferred to post-

St. Athanasius
upheld the
Eustathians.

Sozom. iii. 20.
Socrat. ii. 23.
Theod. ii. 12.
Rufini Hist. Eccl.
x. 19.

pone the matter, or to let it drop. It does not appear whether a church in Antioch was at that time secured for Paulinus and his followers, but

Hist. Eccles. iii. 9. Socrates states that, when Meletius returned to Antioch in the year 362, after his first period of exile, Paulinus was in possession of one of the small churches within the city, from which the newly-intruded Arian bishop Euzoius had not ejected him, out of motives of personal respect.

The Catholic bishops who took part in the election of Meletius, may have been influenced by the desire of rescuing from communion with the Arians, that majority of their fellow-Catholics in Antioch which had been so unhappily betrayed into it; and they probably entertained the hope that the orthodoxy of the new bishop's sentiments would overcome the objections of the Eustathians; whilst they may have considered that the urgency and the peculiar circumstances of the case afforded sufficient excuse for the irregularity of which they themselves were guilty, in uniting with the Arians for his election. The Arians, on the other hand, believing Meletius to belong to themselves, were sanguine in their expectations that his personal powers of persuasion would win over the Eustathians, as well as many others, to their communion. Judging from the description of Meletius which has come down to us, it cannot be denied that there was ground for these anticipations on both sides; and, as regards the Catholics, their hopes were to some extent justified by the result.

The exceptional character of 'the great Meletius' forms one of the most important features of this altogether exceptional passage in the Church's history. Its lustre was obscured until his noble confession at Antioch, but ever afterwards it shone with a brightness rendered the more brilliant from its contrast with the early mists of error which it had so gloriously dispelled and broken through. The excellence of this remarkable man, after his elevation to the see of Antioch, has been depicted in glowing colours by the most eminent of his contemporaries in the East; and the West has testified her assent by the addition of his name to her martyrology, where it is mentioned with distinction.

Description
of
St. Meletius.

Ten years after the election of Meletius to Antioch, St. Basil the Great described him as faultless in his faith, and so excellent in his mode of life that none of the others could be compared with him. St. Epiphanius took the part of Paulinus, but he speaks of the honour due to Meletius on account of his high reputation, his excellent morals, his holy and admirable life which was extolled as divine by all men, and which rendered him in every way longed for by the people. Meletius was then in exile.

Epist. lxxii.
Athanasio,
(ordo novus.)

After the decease of Meletius St. Gregory of Nyssa was unsparing in his praises. He reminds his hearers of his sanctity, his struggles for the faith, his chastity, his eloquence. 'You know,' he exclaims, 'what manner of man he was. Noble and high-born from the rising of the sun, blameless, just, true, fearing

Hæresis lxxiii. c. 35.

Ἐπιτάφιος λόγος
εἰς τὸν
μέγαν Μελέτιον
Ἐπίσκοπον
Ἀντιοχείας.

God, and abstaining from all evil.' He recalls 'the sweet serenity of his eyes, the bright smile upon his lips, the affable extension of his right hand, and the fingers so ready to convey the benediction which his mouth pronounced.' He describes his 'eye as bent on heavenly things, his ear as open to the voice of God, his tongue as devoted to the proclamation of divine truth.'

*Oratio in laudem
S. Meletii.
Bolland. Act. SS.
xii. Feb.*

St. John Chrysostom reminds the people of Antioch how, from the first time that Meletius entered the city, it became a custom for parents to call their children after him, accounting them more dear for the sake of that name, which they looked upon as an ornament and protection, as a safeguard and a solace; as a light amidst darkness, a treasury of innumerable blessings, and a weapon against evil thoughts and desires; so that its sound was heard on all sides, in the streets and in the forum, in the fields and in the roads; and that, not content with this, his image was depicted by many on their rings, their cups, their bowls, and upon the walls of their rooms. He relates how Meletius displayed his meekness and mildness in warding off with his cloak the stones of the indignant populace from the head of the prefect who was bearing him away to exile, on one occasion. He says that 'to gaze on that holy countenance was a source of the greatest delight and enjoyment; for that not only the teaching and conversation, but even the appearance alone, of this blessed man, was

enough to introduce the whole knowledge of virtue into the souls of the beholders.'

St. Gregory Nazianzen, in the poem already referred to, describes Meletius as 'simple, artless in his ways, full of God, calm and confident yet modest in his aspect, showing the culture of the spirit.' He says 'he was what he was called, and he was called what he was—honied in manners and in name.'

Carmen de vitâ suâ,
v. 1515, &c.

Μέλιτος γὰρ καὶ τρόπος καὶ τοῦνομα.

'Many things,' he adds, 'did he endure in behalf of the Divine Spirit (though to a slight extent led astray by an alien hand), brightening grace by illustrious combats.'

The historian Theodoret styles him 'the divine Meletius,' the 'meekest of all men;' and Sozomen tells of the goodness of his life and his powers of speech and of persuasion.

Ecel. Hist. v. 3.

Hist. Ecel. iv. 28.

Such proved to be the character of the bishop whom the Arians obtained for the see of Antioch, relying on the assistance of his powerful advocacy for the promotion of their own heresy. Nor is it surprising that those of the orthodox who did not scruple to act in conjunction with them, should have concurred in their election of Meletius, being secretly aware of his conversion to the truth.

The imperial letters were issued to summon the newly-chosen prelate to Antioch; and, since such was the custom with Constantius, it is to be presumed that he was conveyed on his journey in the

The entrance of
Meletius
into
Antioch.
Ammiani Marcellini
Lib. xxi. c. 16, n. 18.

public carriages. The report of his gifts and virtues had arrived there before him, and when he reached the city, the ways were thronged with the thousands who had issued forth to meet him. Not only the bishops and priests at that time assembled in Antioch, with all the different ranks of ecclesiastics, but the whole of the people, including even the Jews and pagans, and many of the followers of Paulinus, went out to see the person of the far-famed Meletius; a portion of this mixed multitude being led by curiosity, and others being desirous to hear from him a declaration of his sentiments, for the rumour had now got abroad that he was in favour of the Nicene faith.—‘Then,’ says St. Gregory of Nyssa, ‘the Church of Antioch beheld a countenance formed truly in the image of God; she beheld charity gushing forth as from a fountain; grace diffused upon his lips; the extreme height of humility; one after whom there is nothing more to be imagined. She beheld in him the mildness of David; the understanding of Solomon; the goodness of Moses; the exactitude of Samuel; the chastity of Joseph; the wisdom of Daniel; the zeal for the faith of the great Elias; the bodily purity of the sublime John; the invincible love of Paul. She beheld so great a collection of virtues in this one soul; she was smitten with a blessed love, loving her spouse with a chaste and holy affection!’

Even allowing for Eastern hyperbole, no ordinary character could have called forth this encomium.

Theod. ii. 31.

Sozom. iv. 28.

Nieph. Callist. ix. 48.

In loco citato.

Theodoret says that the emperor requested Meletius, together with other eminent preachers, to expound to the people a certain text from the Proverbs, which at that time formed one of the special subjects of controversy, and that he appointed practised writers to take down the words of each. George, the Bishop of Laodicea, was the first to speak, and he vomited forth the ill savour of poisonous heresy. Acacius of Cæsarea followed next, and he framed his speech in a middle course, avoiding the blasphemy of the extreme party, but not retaining the pure and genuine mark of Apostolic doctrine. After these arose Meletius, and he boldly set forth the rule of truth, unhesitatingly making manifest the orthodoxy of his belief. Loud were the applauses of the Catholics, and great was the confusion of the heretics. According to Sozomen, it was said that the archdeacon of the clergy of Antioch rushed up to Meletius in fury, and stopped his mouth; upon which Meletius, holding up at first three of his fingers and then only one, proclaimed the same faith still more clearly by this action, than he had previously done by his words so long as his voice was free. The archdeacon then hastening to seize upon his hand, involuntarily set at liberty his lips, and so enabled Meletius again to give verbal testimony to the faith. He proclaimed it still more strongly and more plainly than before, loudly exhorting his hearers to maintain steadfastly the doctrines of Nicæa, and protesting that such as were otherwise minded erred concerning the truth.

His public profession
of the faith,
Ecel. Hist. ii. 31.

Ch. viii. 22.

Hist. Ecel. iv. 28.

Whilst Meletius was thus preaching the Catholic faith, by speech and by gesture alternately, as the violence of the archdeacon allowed him, ‘the Eustathians,’ proceeds Sozomen, ‘cried out aloud and leaped for joy, but the Arians were downcast.’ Theodoret does not mention the story of this unseemly conduct of the archdeacon, but he says that the multitude greatly applauded the sermon of Meletius, and entreated him to give them a compendium of his teaching, upon which, ‘displaying three fingers, then closing two of them and leaving one extended, he uttered the praiseworthy sentence — “There are three understood by the mind, but we reason as of one: Τρία τὰ νοούμενα · ὡς ἐνὶ δὲ διαλεξιόμεθα.”’

Ecel. Hist. ii. 31.

Euzoius
made
Arian Bishop
of
Antioch.
Theod. ii. 31.
Sozom. iv. 28.
Soerat. ii. 44.
Philostorg. v. 5.

The Arians at first endeavoured to induce Meletius to retract his profession of the Catholic faith. But finding that he remained firm, and that he would in no wise alter his sentiments, they persuaded the Emperor to expel him from the church, and he was banished to his own country, Melitene, when scarce thirty days had elapsed since his public entry into Antioch as its newly-elected bishop. The arch-heretic Euzoius, the friend of Arius, and who, when a deacon in Alexandria, had been condemned together with him by St. Alexander then archbishop of that see, was now summoned by the emperor and thrust into the bishopric of Antioch; the whole being the work of those selfsame persons, who had been foremost in the choice of Meletius when they supposed him to entertain their own opinions.

Theodoret says that the accusation now made against Meletius was that of the profession of Sabelianism. It was a charge which the Arians very frequently brought against the orthodox; but in the present instance their principal motive may have been that which is mentioned by their own partisan, Philostorgius, who relates that ‘Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, was banished by Constantius, who was then residing at Antioch, to his own country, Melitene, as being convicted of perjury, and because that “whilst going out of his way he set forth the *homoousion*, he conformed himself to the *heterousion*” (τὰ ὁμοούσιον πρεσβεύων ἐκτόπως, τὸ ἑτεροούσιον κατεσχρηματίζεται).’ It is not easy to acquit Meletius from the reproach of duplicity before his election to the see of Antioch; or to justify his acceptance of that bishopric at the hands of the Arians, whilst he allowed them at the same time to assume that he was one of themselves. Nor is it surprising that they should have been filled with indignation, and have been eager to depose him, when they discovered the mistake which they had made.

Accusations
against
Meletius.
In loc. citat.

In loc. citat.

The above-mentioned sermon of Meletius has been preserved by St. Epiphanius in his celebrated work against heresies. It commences with the praise of peace and an exhortation to love God and keep His commandments, and afterwards it proceeds to speak of doctrine. After reciting this discourse at length, St. Epiphanius says that the Arians, now finding Meletius to be ‘an offence to them instead of a source

His sermon.

Hæres. lxxiii. 29, &c.

Ibid. c. 31.

of joy and repose,' stirred up the emperor and turned him out of the bishopric; adding that he was carried off into banishment by night, and was then still living¹ in exile in his own country, honoured and prized both on account of what he had accomplished, and of the true and genuine faith which was maintained by his flock in Antioch. In a subsequent passage, St. Epiphanius observes respecting this sermon of Meletius, that there are found in it two or three reprehensible sayings, though he does not know whether they escaped unnoticed in the excitement of preaching, or whether they arose out of the simplicity of the preacher's mind.

Ibid. c. 35.

Op. omn. t. viii. p. 785,
ed. citat.

St. Jerome, in the opening page of his continuation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, names Meletius simply as one of the intruded Arian line, remarking that he should consider them 'rather as the enemies of Christ than as bishops;' and in a subsequent passage, after stating that Meletius was transferred to Antioch by the Arian bishops, Acacius and George, he says, that not long after, having 'received priests who had been deposed by his predecessor, Eudoxius, he gave a false colouring to a most just cause of exile by a sudden change of faith (*ex illi justissimam causam subita fidei mutatione delusit*).'¹ St. Jerome appears to have derived this information from the people of

Ibid. p. 805

¹ Meletius had returned from his first banishment several years before this account of it was written by St. Epiphanius, but he had again been banished twice, and was then undergoing his third and last period of exile. See Tillemont, note vi. sur S. Melèce.

whom St. Epiphanius says that he cannot tell whether they were carried away by hatred or envy, or whether they wished to advance their own cause, but that they insinuated certain things, such as that the movement against Meletius was not on account of his orthodoxy, but because, they said, of canonical matters and trouble between himself and his clergy, and because he received some whom he had previously rejected and anathematized. St. Epiphanius adds, that he paid no regard at all to these things, chiefly because of the ensuing daily amendment amongst the followers of Meletius, and their confession of the faith. There was a subsequent charge against the orthodoxy of Meletius, which was equally unfounded.

Heres. lxxiii. 35.

It is essential to bear in mind the currency of such stories at the time, as well as the acknowledged previous connection of Meletius with the Arians, in order to form a just estimate of the conduct of Rome and the West, under the very perplexing combination of circumstances which ensued. The early errors of Meletius were nobly atoned for; and the later charges against him were doubtless misrepresentations; but it must be remembered that, however unjust the accusations might be, they would wear a greater semblance of truth from the fact of his culpable antecedents, and that the conflicting evidence, and the circumstances of the times, rendered it extremely difficult for persons in a distant country to arrive quickly at a positive conclusion.

The ways of Providence are inscrutable, but God

acts through human means, and, as is suggested by Tillemont, it may have been in expiation of the faults of his youth that St. Meletius was permitted to remain for the greater part of his life, without any formal and express acknowledgment of his ecclesiastical position on the part of the see of Rome; and that he never enjoyed direct and formal episcopal communion with St. Athanasius; for although at one time he seemed on the point of it, it was unaccountably postponed, and that illustrious confessor was called to his reward above, before the position of St. Meletius in Antioch had been universally recognised.

The change effected
in
Antioch.

Oratio in laudem
S. Meletii.

The expectations of the Catholics were in no small degree fulfilled through the benefits which religion derived from the election of Meletius to Antioch. St. John Chrysostom reminds the people of that city how, during the short interval of the thirty days, or less, which elapsed between his entrance and his exile, he had succeeded in cutting off from the Church corrupt and incurable members, and in restoring health to the multitude; and how he had so firmly implanted the truth in the hearts of the faithful, that it was not henceforth to be rooted up by the violence of future storms, or corrupted through the subtlety of future temptations. He had completely won over those many Catholics whom he had found in outward communion with the Arians, but who returned to them no more after the banishment of Meletius. Such of the faithful as acknowledged him for their bishop, rejected with firmness the

Rufin. x. 24.
Theod. ii. 31; iii. 4.
Vales. annot. in loc.
Soerit. ii. 44.
Sozom. iv. 28.
Tillemont, s. Vital et
S. Philogono.

communion of the newly-intruded Euzoius, and assembled apart for their religious worship in the old church of the old town, which was at that time a suburb outside the city gates, and was called the Palæa (ἡ παλαιά), on account of its antiquity. The church appears to have been frequently designated by the same title, though Theodoret styles it the ‘Apostolic Church,’ and it is said to have occupied the place of a church of apostolic origin, in which the chair of St. Peter was first established.

The Eustathians, under their priest Paulinus, held aloof from Meletius, whilst they rejected Euzoius; and, in fact, neither the present orthodoxy of the former, nor yet his sufferings in behalf of the faith and noble confession of the Nicene Creed, were sufficient of themselves to remedy the essential invalidity of his election by the Arians, until the application of the formal indulgence accorded for such cases by the subsequent council of Alexandria. It was on this account, together, it was said, with some hesitation respecting Arian baptism, that the Eustathians could not be persuaded to unite with the Catholics under Meletius, though they were at one with them respecting the faith. ‘One,’ says Theodoret, ‘was the confession of faith on both sides. For each party contended for the doctrine expounded at Nicæa.’ Socrates states, that after the banishment of Meletius, ‘those who retained their disposition towards him, abandoning the congregation of the Arians, held their assemblies by themselves;’ those who had believed in

The Eustathians remain apart, though the Meletians confess the same faith.

Theod. iii. 4.
Socrat. ii. 44.
Sozom. iv. 28.
Niceph. Callist. ix. 48.

the *homoousion* from the first being unwilling to communicate with them, 'because Meletius had been ordained through the vote of the Arians, and because his followers had been baptized by them.' 'In this way,' he adds, 'the church in Antioch also was divided into two parts, each of them holding one and the same doctrine.' Sozomen says precisely the same. Nicephorus Callistus, who, though a more recent author, sometimes throws light on the ancient historians, states that 'though both sides were united in doctrine, yet they were separated on the sole account of the election of Meletius.' In the preceding sentence, however, he mentions also the Arian baptism as one of the grounds of separation. This would appear to have been an unfounded objection, if it really was made; otherwise it could hardly have failed to have been noticed in the subsequent letter from the council of Alexandria to the Antiochians, which makes no mention of it.

Return
of the
exiled bishops.

The first exile of Meletius was not of long duration. The Emperor Constantius died towards the close of the year 361, and his successor, the apostate Julian, permitted all bishops then in banishment for religion, to return to the occupation of their sees. According to the pagan historian, he wished to leave the Christians to their internal dissensions that he might have the less to fear from the unanimity of the people. Meletius therefore was recalled from Melitene, in Armenia, to which he had been banished, and he returned to Antioch in the year

Ammian. Marcell.
xxii. 5.

362. The same event released also the two great Western bishops, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Cagliari, from their exile in the Upper Thebais. Lucifer had been one of the papal legates at the council of Milan in the year 355. Eusebius of Vercelli had joined the apostolic legates on that occasion, and had taken a prominent part in the proceedings. Together with the papal legates he had distinguished himself in the council by his firmness in refusing to communicate with the Arians, or to condemn St. Athanasius in his absence; he had been banished in consequence, as well as Lucifer and others, and he had suffered incredible hardships.

Baron. *Annal. Eccl.*
an. 355.

The division between the Catholics of Antioch could not fail to prove a source of grief and of solicitude to these holy confessors, as well as to the universal body of the orthodox, and it formed an object of special attention in the important synod which was held at Alexandria in the year 362.

Efforts to reunite
the Catholics of
Antioch.

Cardinal Baronius considers that the Pope Liberius was the author and promoter of this synod, in his anxiety to repair the damages which the Catholic cause had sustained at Rimini. There are stronger reasons for supposing this to have been the case than those which are adduced by the learned cardinal.

Annal. Eccl., an.
362, nn. clxxvii. ccvi.

The same eminent author is further of opinion that Eusebius, the bishop of Vercelli, and Lucifer, the bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, were nominated by the Pope as his legates for the above-named Alexan-

The legations
of
Eusebius and Lucifer.

drian council, and he also considers that the active and prominent part which was taken by these noble and indefatigable warriors of Christ in behalf of the Catholic cause throughout the East, and particularly by Lucifer in the affairs of Antioch, was in virtue of the same legatine authority. The conduct of these two Western prelates, and the manner in which their assistance was universally received and accepted, are plain indications that they were entrusted by the Apostolic See with powers of extraordinary jurisdiction and authority in the East; nor is there wanting more direct evidence in justification of this conclusion.

De concord. Sacerd. et
Imp. v. 15.

Discip. de l'Église,
P. i. L. ii. ch. cxvii. 8.

It must be observed, that De Marca is of opinion that they acted in virtue of former legatine faculties not yet become extinct. Thomassin refers to him, and adopts the same view. But this explanation is unsatisfactory, to say the least. The *dignity* conferred by the office would certainly remain in a lesser degree attached to the person of the bearer after the office itself had ceased. But the ecclesiastical *faculties* given with it, could only continue for the period and the purpose for which they had originally been granted. It seems hardly probable that the powers delegated by the Pope to his representatives in a Western council, should have extended so far as to confer upon them future authority in questions which had not then arisen, and future jurisdiction over Eastern churches, which, at that time, there was no idea of their visiting. Moreover, it does not appear that Eusebius was ever constituted one of the papal

legates at Milan, though he was undoubtedly most closely associated with the previous cognate embassy from the Pope to Constantius in Gaul. This embassy occurred in the year 354, after the lapse, which happily proved but temporary, of the Pope's legate, Vincentius of Capua, and its object was to obtain the consent of the emperor for the celebration of a council, which was held in the following year at Milan. The legates originally appointed by Liberius for this embassy were Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, the priest Pancratius, and the deacon Hilarius. Eusebius of Vercelli, was himself a native of Sardinia, which would form a further motive for his union with Lucifer, in addition to the burning zeal for the faith which filled the hearts of both. Liberius wrote expressly to Eusebius to solicit him to accompany his legates to Constantius, and the language of the Pope makes manifest how highly he estimated the virtues of the holy Bishop of Vercelli. He greets Eusebius with an earnest expression of the consolation he had derived from his unconquered faith, 'by which,' says the Pope, 'following the precepts of the Gospels, thou hast in no way deviated from the fellowship of the Apostolic See. *Me, frater carissime, ad solatium vite presentis erigit invicta fides tua, qua secutus Evangeliorum precepta, nullo genere, a consortio sedis apostolicæ discrepasti.*' In a subsequent letter he more especially commends to Eusebius the above-named legates, begging of him to accompany them on their mission, to unite himself to their fellow-

Constant.
coll. 422, 7, 8.
Epist. Liberii Papæ
iii. v. vii.

ship, that, wherever it may be, he may be also, and that 'united in conference and in counsel, they may perform that which is pleasing to God and His angels, and expedient for the Catholic Church.' Eusebius replied with an assent to the request, upon which the Pope honoured him with another letter, expressive of his satisfaction, and of his confidence that the cause would be more prosperous since Eusebius would not desert his brethren, and he bade him to 'labour as a good soldier who expects the reward of the eternal Emperor.' 'Holding,' adds the Pope, 'this life in contempt, show yourself a truth-speaking priest, that through your joint labours for the state of the Church the council may be celebrated.' It is therefore evident that Eusebius was formally associated by Liberius with his legates in this embassy to Constantius, and that, in this way, a special legation was, on that occasion, entrusted to him, although he is not mentioned in the letter sent by the Pope to the emperor through Lucifer, in which the names of the other legates are expressly enumerated. It does not, however, appear that Eusebius occupied the office of a papal legate in the council which was convened during the subsequent year at Milan. At the first he hesitated to attend it, but his presence being especially solicited by the synod and the emperor, as well as by the papal legates, he ultimately went up to the council in company with the legates, and distinguished himself in union with them by his courageous defence of the Nicene faith.

Constant. col. 423.

Baron. Ann. Eccl.
an. 355.

The epistle sent by Liberius to Eusebius and Lucifer, together with Dionysius, during their subsequent exile in the East, contains no instructions on ecclesiastical matters. But it is supposed to have been written in the very year of their banishment, A.D. 355, seven years previous to the synod of Alexandria now in question, and it is impossible to say what subsequent communications may have been transmitted to Eusebius and Lucifer, from Rome, either through letters now lost, or orally through confidential messengers. The difficulties of the times and the consequent importance of secrecy frequently rendered it unadvisable to entrust such matters to writing; and this circumstance, together with the loss of documents to an extent of which we can form no idea, will account for our ignorance respecting many perplexing passages in the Church's early history. A candid enquirer after truth will not refuse to explain any such doubtful point according to the established constitution of the Church, and her existing laws and customs, rather than appeal to it as a ground for disbelieving in them, or as an excuse for disobeying them.

Ep. vii. Constant.
col. 429.

In the instance before us, however, we are in possession of positive historical evidence as to the fact of the legations of Eusebius and Lucifer in the East, though we have not any record of the time or the manner in which they were conferred upon them. Father Papebrochius, in the Bollandist life of Lucifer of Cagliari, gives the following words, as

Historical testimony
to
their legations.

Acta Sanctorum.
Die xx Maii, c.v. n. 45.

attributed to St. Honoratus, who was a disciple of St. Eusebius, and the second successor to his bishopric. The words are taken from a life of St. Eusebius preserved in the archives of Vercelli, and they may be literally translated as follows:—‘ St. Eusebius was present and presided in the Alexandrian council with Athanasius, and he had four legations, one to Constantius with Lucifer the Sardinian; another with the same to the Alexandrian synod; another, after the synod, to the Oriental Churches; the fourth, afterwards, into the West. But the first three he had with Lucifer, the last indeed alone, without any companion.’ Papebrochius appears to think it questionable whether these words really came from St. Honoratus. However this may be, they bear internal evidence of their accuracy, in the fact that they do not ascribe to Eusebius any legation to the council of Milan, which a careless or unscrupulous eulogist would certainly have been apt to do. To say the least, the document must be accepted in evidence of the local tradition of the period to which it belongs, and, unless proved to be a forgery, of which there does not appear to be any suspicion, its authority cannot reasonably be set aside; especially since the statement which it contains, derives confirmation from the conduct of Eusebius and Lucifer in the East, as recorded in ecclesiastical history. Had they acted as they did without authority from the Roman Pontiff, they would have grievously violated the laws of the Church, and not only the eastern

bishops would have loudly protested against their interference and denounced their proceedings, but Rome herself would have been foremost in condemning them.

When Eusebius and Lucifer were released from their exile, they took counsel between themselves, and with others of the orthodox, respecting the means to be adopted for the reinforcement of the ecclesiastical laws and the restoration of peace to the church, especially as regarded Antioch, which occupied the first position in the East, and where, in the words of Theodoret, 'the sound body of the church was separated into two parts.' It was finally decided for Lucifer to proceed to Antioch, and for Eusebius to go to Alexandria, 'in order,' says Socrates, 'that, together with Athanasius, having assembled a synod, the dogmata of the church might be strengthened.' He afterwards states that, 'when Eusebius had reached Alexandria, he quickly, along with Athanasius, called together the synod.' Sozomen says the same. We learn, however, from Theodoret and Rufinus, that Eusebius at the first asked Lucifer to accompany him to Alexandria, but that Lucifer would not accede to his request, being intent on the settlement of the affairs of Antioch. He sent, however, his deacon to the synod in his stead, and agreed to acquiesce through him in its acts. The historians speak of one deacon only as sent by Lucifer; though the letter from the synod to the Antiochians expressly gives the names of two.

The
course pursued
by
Eusebius and Lucifer.
Theod. iii. 4, 5.
Socrat. iii. 5, 6, 7.
Sozom. v. 12.
Rufin. i. (x.) 27.

The two bishops, Cymatius of Paltus, and Anatolius of Eubœa, are associated with Lucifer and the others in the address of the same letter, and since they are not named as present in the council, they may perhaps have accompanied Lucifer to Antioch, or may have met him in that city.

Council
of
Alexandria,
A.D. 362.
Hist. Eccl. i. (x.) 28.

This celebrated synod of Alexandria is described by Rufinus as a 'council of confessors, few in number, but perfect in faith, and many in merits.' Besides giving their attention to such points of doctrine as required it, without adding to what was done at Nicæa, the assembled bishops applied themselves especially to deliberate upon the best measures to be taken for the restoration of tranquillity throughout the church, and for the reparation of the damage which had been sustained through the Arians. They had before them a question of incalculable importance respecting the manner in which converts returning from heresy were to be dealt with, and particularly as to whether such as had received ordination, were to be admitted according to their rank amongst the Catholic clergy. There were those whose zeal for the faith led them to counsel that, though the orders could not be forfeited, such persons should be suspended from the ecclesiastical office as unworthy. Others more imbued with apostolic charity maintained, that those who had remained steadfast should stoop to lift up the fallen, and should humble themselves in order to recover the feeble who had been led astray. Such was the

course best suited to the interests of the Christian people in general, who would have been strongly opposed to any measure which, on account of a culpable weakness now lamented, would have severed from them pastors whom they loved, and whom they knew to have renounced their error. After careful discussion the side of mercy was preferred, at the same time that a just distinction was drawn between the deceivers and the deceived. Pardon was proclaimed for all who penitently sought for reconciliation; but such as had been chiefs and leaders among the heretics were not to be admitted to a place amongst the clergy. Those, however, who had fallen through violence or surprise, and now repented of their error, were to be admitted not only to pardon, but were also to be received to their rank amongst the clergy, particularly, says St. Athanasius, since such persons alleged in excuse that they had yielded to the Arians in order to prevent the corruption of the church and the ruin of the people, through the appointment of most impious pastors in their stead. All who came back from heresy, or from communion with heretics, were further required to make a profession of the faith of Nicæa, and to anathematize the contrary errors. This wise and salutary indulgence thus conceded by the assembled bishops, was universally approved and welcomed, and it was confirmed by the authority of the Roman See. St. Jerome declared it to be the salvation of the church. ‘The West,’ he says,

St. Athanas. Epist.
ad
Rufinianum.

Dialog. advers.
Luciferianos, n. 20.

‘assented to this decision, and by this so necessary council the world was rescued from the jaws of Satan.’

The case of
Meletius.

The principle on which this concession was grounded, applied manifestly to the position of Meletius and his friends. We have evidence that such was the traditional opinion at Rome, in the appeal which was made to the case as a precedent by the papal legate in the seventh general council, the second of Nicaea, A.D. 787. The same question of the reception of repentant heretics being then under discussion, and various authorities being produced in testimony of the former practice of the church, it is recorded in the acts of the said council, that—

Hard. Act. Concil.
t. iv. coll. 63, 64.

‘Peter the priest, most dear to God, and representative of Adrian the most holy Pope of Rome, said, “As say the historians, the holy Meletius was ordained by the Arians, and he ascended the ambo and proclaimed the homoousion, and the ordination was not rejected.”

‘Theodore, the most holy Bishop of Catana, and they who were with him, the bishops of Sicily, said, “The archpriest of the apostolic chair has spoken truly.”

‘Tarasius, the most holy patriarch, said, “In nothing do we find the holy fathers disagreeing,”’ &c. &c.

But besides the concession of the indulgence in general, and its consequent application to Meletius, the position of the church in Antioch called for and received the particular attention of the bishops as-

sembled in Alexandria. They carefully examined the questions connected with it, and the conclusions at which they arrived were summed up, after many of the bishops had departed for their dioceses, by those who were left in Alexandria, in a letter replete with the spirit of wisdom and charity, and which appears to have been written by St. Athanasius himself. Besides being found in the collections of the councils, this letter is published amongst the works of St. Athanasius, under the title, 'Ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀντιοχεῖς τόμος Ἀθανασίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας.

It is stated at the close of the epistle that it was written to the five following bishops:—‘Eusebius, of Vercelli, a city of Gaul;¹ Lucifer, of the island of Sardinia; Asterius, of Petra in Arabia; Cymatius, of Paltus in Cœlesyria; and Anatolius, of Eubœa.’ It is observable that precedence is here given to the names of Eusebius and Lucifer, and after them to that of Asterius, who was to accompany Eusebius to Antioch. It is also stated that those who sent the epistle were—‘Pope Athanasius and those who were with him in Alexandria, Eusebius himself, and Asterius, and the rest,’ whose names then follow. Eusebius and Asterius, having assisted at the council, were numbered amongst the bishops who sent the letter; though, being also entrusted with the execution of the decrees, they were necessarily at the same time included amongst those to whom it was

T. i. p. ii. p. 615.
ed. Patav. 1777.

The tomo
of
St. Athanasius
to the
Antiochians.

¹ That is to say, of Cisalpine Gaul, a part of Italy.

addressed. In a preceding paragraph it is mentioned that the document was also subscribed by the two deacons sent to the Council by Lucifer, as well as by two other deacons from Paulinus, who, though only a priest, was thus represented at the synod, as the head of the acknowledged Catholic party in Antioch, the bishopric being, strictly speaking, vacant.¹ There is no express mention of Meletius, nor of his having been in any way represented in the council.

Commencement
of the
epistle.

The bishops in Alexandria commenced the letter by expressing their confidence in the ability of the bishops they were addressing to set in order all the affairs of the Church, but added, that they considered it necessary to write as they did in

¹ Baronius (an. 362, nn. 180, 215, 216.) considers that Paulinus, before sending his deacons to the council of Alexandria, had been consecrated bishop by Lucifer, and that the council approved of his consecration. Valesius also thinks (Annot. in Socrat. Hist. Eccl. iii. 5) that the consecration of Paulinus by Lucifer preceded the mission of the deacons to the council. But this opinion appears to be untenable. It does not accord with the circumstances related by the early historians, and it is also at variance with the whole tenor of the letter of the same synod to the Antiochians. That document mentions Paulinus and his party, but it never speaks of him as a bishop. He is not styled brother, or fellow-minister, by its authors in any portion of it. It assigns him no part in the task of the reception of the converts from heresy or from heretical communion, which was one that belonged essentially to the office of the bishop. If, at the time when the epistle was written, the bishops who sent it had been aware of and had approved the consecration of Paulinus, they would certainly have expressly recognised his episcopal rank, and they would have included his name amongst those of the bishops they were addressing. See Tillemont, Hist. Eccl. t. vii. note ii. sur Lucifer de Cagliari; also, Pagi, Not. in Baron. Annal. Eccl. in loc. citat.

consequence of the good tidings which had reached them, that many formerly separated from them through party spirit (*διὰ φιλονεικίαν*) were now desirous for reconciliation, and that many also were abandoning the Arian heresy, and seeking their communion. They say that they wish they could join the other bishops in person, but that, as they have stated in other letters, they are prevented by the necessities of the church, and they express their gratitude to Eusebius and Asterius, who, instead of returning to their own dioceses, have agreed at their request to proceed to Antioch in their place, on account of the church's urgent need, adding,—‘We are consoled by their consent, because when they and yourselves are there, we account ourselves all to be present with you.’

The epistle then proceeds:—‘Call to you all therefore who desire to make peace with us, and especially those who assemble in the *Palæa*’ (the Meletians), ‘and those who fly from the Arians, and receive them as fathers would receive their sons, and as their teachers and guides accept them back, and, uniting them to our beloved Paulinus and those who are with him (*συνάψαντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἀγαπῆτοῖς ἡμῶν τοῖς περὶ Παυλῖνον*), demand nothing more from them than to anathematize the heresy of the Arians, and to profess the faith professed by the holy fathers at Nicæa, and to anathematize also the existing heresies against the Holy Ghost, with those of Sabellius and others. ‘When these things are done,’ add the

Instructions
respecting
Antioch.

fathers, 'all evil suspicion will be removed on all sides, and there will be shown forth only the pure faith of the Catholic Church.' After observing that no one can be ignorant that they themselves, as well as those who have always been in communion with them, hold the same faith, the Alexandrian fathers say again:—'Since, then, we rejoice with those who desire to be united with us, with all such indeed, but especially with those who assemble in the Palæa, and we have very exceedingly given glory to the Lord, both on account of all, and because of the good purpose of these, we exhort you that concord may be established on these conditions, and that nothing more than these, as we have before said, be required by you of those who assemble in the Palæa; and that Paulinus and his party put forward nothing different, and nothing more than was put forward at Nicæa.' They declare that a certain writing attributed to the Council of Sardica is spurious, and not to be acknowledged or brought forward at all, nor yet anything else besides the Nicene profession of faith.

The question
of the
Hypostases.

The fathers then pass on to treat of the difference concerning the Hypostases. They state that, having examined into the doctrine of those who were accused of Arianism because they maintained that there were three divine Hypostases, it became evident that the term was applied by them to the Divine Persons, and that they acknowledged the unity of the Divine Substance; and that having afterwards questioned the others who were charged with Sabellianism because

they maintained one only hypostasis in the Godhead, they found that the term was applied by them to the Divine Substance, and that they never intended to deny that there were three distinct and Divine Persons in the one God. Thus, both these parties were found to unite in the Catholic doctrine, and merely to differ respecting the application of the term, and both of them alike anathematized Arius, and Sabellius, and the other heretics. ‘After these explanations,’ proceeds the letter, ‘all, by the grace of God, agreed that the profession of faith of the fathers at Nicæa was better and more accurate than terms of this kind, and that for the future they ought in preference to be satisfied with the words of that council, and to make use of them.’

After treating of another point, which was connected with the Apollinarian heresy, and which concerned the doctrine of the Incarnation, the fathers in Alexandria earnestly exhorted the bishops they were addressing, to dissuade the people from entertaining mere questions about words, and as faithful servants and stewards of the Lord, to prevent all such occasions of offence and of discord, and to prefer peace to everything of the kind, provided the faith was sound.

Finally, they gave directions to the said bishops to read the letter in public, in the place where they were accustomed to assemble in Antioch, and to have all men called there to them. ‘For it is right,’ said the fathers, ‘that the epistle should first be read there, and that there those who wish and seek for peace

Exhortation
to
avoid idle questions.

Conclusion
of
the epistle.

should be united with one another; and afterwards when they are united together, that the assemblies should be concluded wherever it may be pleasing to all the people, your excellencies being present, and that the Lord should be glorified by all in common.' The salutation which then follows appears to indicate that the letter was written by St. Athanasius, in the name of the other bishops:—'The brethren who are with me salute you. I pray that you may be well, and that you will make mention of us to the Lord. I Athanasius: likewise the other bishops assembled together have subscribed,' &c. Eusebius further subscribed separately to a short Latin form of acquiescence in the decision respecting the Hypostases, and other points connected with the faith, to which Asterius added his assent. There is also subjoined to the document a subsequent profession of faith from Paulinus.

Hist. Eccl. i. (x.) 29.

It is stated by Rufinus that, after the bishops had arrived at their decision, by a decree of the council the charge (*procuratio*) of the East, was committed to Asterius and those who were with him, and that of the West, to Eusebius. This, no doubt, refers to the promulgation of the acts of the synod. But nothing more is heard of Asterius. It is conjectured that he may have died immediately afterwards, and it appears from subsequent events that Eusebius took charge of the matter in the East, as well as in the West.

Tillemont, Hist. Eccl.
St. Athanase.
art. xcix.

In addition to its general importance, this letter is

particularly valuable as a testimony to the judgment of leading Catholic bishops of the day, including the great St. Athanasius, upon the position of ecclesiastical affairs in Antioch at the period when it was written. It is especially to be observed that this letter distinctly recognised Paulinus and those under him, as forming the Catholic body in Antioch, and that it required the others to be united with them before any further step was taken. But no sort of submission was required to Paulinus individually, nor were his personal claims in any way put forward. It is also to be remarked that the letter contained no allusion to Meletius or to the question of the bishopric. But so soon as the reconciliation had been effected, the choice of the church for the concluding thanksgiving was to be left to the people in general. They were therefore left at liberty to select the church occupied by the Meletians, and, provided Paulinus and his party had consented, the fathers would, in all probability, have rejoiced to have seen all the Catholics of Antioch united under Meletius as their bishop, after he had fulfilled the few and easy conditions which were imposed by the council. At the same time they would not be disposed to press such an arrangement upon the Eustathians against their will, out of deference to their long and unswerving fidelity, and to their position as the old Catholic party; a position which rendered the case of Antioch peculiar and exceptional, and, in fact, which constituted the difficulty. It is evident, how-

Remarks
upon the letter.

ever, from the above-cited epistle, that the Meletians were desirous to be reconciled with the great Catholic body, and if all parties had been guided by the spirit which prevailed in the council, it may reasonably be supposed that some mode would have been discovered of terminating the local dissension, especially since any necessary concessions for the sake of peace, might have been hoped for from one of the character of Meletius. But an event which had occurred without the knowledge of the synod, rendered fruitless all its endeavours for a speedy reconciliation.

Lucifer consecrates
Paulinus.

The ardent zeal of the enthusiastic and severe Lucifer, could not brook the delay which was calculated to prove most conducive to the successful accomplishment of his mission; nor could he curb his natural eagerness into the patience which appears to have been called for by the circumstances, involving as they did many obvious considerations of charity and of wisdom. Whilst the bishops were deliberating at Alexandria, Lucifer was acting at Antioch. Without waiting for the decisions of the council, or even for the assistance of his more aged and more prudent, but certainly no less devoted colleague St. Eusebius, he freely exercised the authority which had been delegated to him.

Theol. iii. 5.
Socrat. iii. 6.
Sozom. v. 12.
Rufin. i. (x.) 27.

Apparently wearied with the fruitlessness of the repeated discourses upon concord, by which at first he had vainly endeavoured to reconcile the divided Catholics of Antioch, and finding the Eustathians to

be firm in the maintenance of their claims, he consecrated bishop their leader Paulinus, having obtained the assistance of two other bishops for the purpose, as is mentioned by St. Jerome, who thus records it in his Chronicle :—‘ Eusebius and Lucifer return from exile, of whom Lucifer, two other confessors ¹ being procured, makes bishop on the Catholic side at Antioch, Paulinus, presbyter of bishop Eustathius, who had never defiled himself by communion with heretics.’ Meletius had not yet returned to Antioch from his place of banishment, and it is possible that Lucifer wished to anticipate that event. The personal excellence of Paulinus does not appear to have been called in question. But in one respect this even tended to an increase of the difficulty ; because it strengthened the claims of the Eustathians, which, on the one hand could not be set aside, and on the other, could not be acknowledged so fully as strict justice might have required, without the exercise of an undue and repulsive severity towards Meletius and his followers who were desirous for reconciliation. At the very moment when mutual concessions might have healed and terminated the schism, it was aggravated and prolonged through this mistaken zeal of Lucifer. Theo-

Op. omn. t. viii.
p. 805,
ed. citat.

¹ It is stated in a note on this passage that Scaliger found the names of these two bishops in a very ancient codex, given as *Gorgonius de Germania* (qy. *Germanicia*, in Syria?), and *Cymatius de Gabala*. Tillemont thinks this may have been the same Cymatius who was one of the five to whom the letter was addressed from Alexandria, and who was therein styled, *of Paltus*, which was not far from Gabala. Tillemont, *Lucif. de Cagl.* iv.

doret says, that Lucifer, ‘not doing well (*οὐκ εὖ γένοιτο*),’ consecrated Paulinus bishop for the Eustathians. ‘This,’ he adds, ‘prolonged that dissension, for it lasted for five-and-eighty years,’ &c. He counts from the time of the banishment of St. Eustathius, A.D. 330–1. Rufinus says that the two dissentient Catholic parties in Antioch were hoping that unity might be restored, if such a bishop could be chosen for them as would prove agreeable not only to one side but to both, when Lucifer, ‘in over haste (*præproperus*) made Paulinus bishop, a Catholic indeed and a holy man, and in all respects worthy of the episcopate, but yet one in whom both parties amongst the people could not acquiesce.’

Eusebius arrives
in
Antioch.

Socrat. iii. 9.
Sozom. v. 13.
Rufin. i. (x.) 30.
Theod. iii. 5.

When the proceedings of the council had terminated in Alexandria, St. Eusebius of Vercelli went immediately to Antioch. On learning what had been done there, he was greatly distressed, and declined to acknowledge either party. According to Rufinus, he had visited that city before the council was assembled, and had led the people to anticipate from it a satisfactory termination of their dissensions. He was greatly disturbed that the rashness of Lucifer should have frustrated these designs of peace. Rufinus thus relates the occurrence:—‘But when Eusebius returned to Antioch, and found a bishop ordained there by Lucifer, contrary to what was promised, driven off both by shame and indignation, he departed, opening his communion to neither side, because when he went away from thence, he had

promised that he would bring it to pass in the council that such a bishop should be ordained for them as would be declined by neither party.' It appears, however, from Socrates and Sozomen, that Eusebius did not leave Antioch till he had made every possible exertion to unite the divided parties, but unhappily without success. At length, 'perceiving,' says Theodoret, 'that the evil had become well-nigh incurable through faulty treatment,' he went away, after proclaiming to both sides that the position of affairs should be set straight in a synod of bishops. The respect which he entertained for Lucifer deterred him from giving vent in public to any expression of his displeasure. Eusebius, together with the other bishops, had recognised the communion of Paulinus and his party in the letter from the Alexandrian synod, and it is therefore evident that in holding aloof from it on his arrival in Antioch, he was actuated by the strong disapprobation with which he regarded the consecration of a bishop in whom both parties could not agree, and probably also by the desire of making it known that he had not himself consented to the act. Lucifer was very greatly offended and displeased in consequence, but it would lead me too far from my subject to enter on his future history, which is involved in great obscurity.¹

¹ According to ancient historians, the above-mentioned difference respecting the consecration of Paulinus, gave rise to the subsequent schism of the Luciferians, who separated themselves

The position
of
Paulinus.

Though no question could arise as to the validity of the episcopal order conferred upon Paulinus by his consecration, a very serious question might arise respecting the validity of his jurisdiction. Had Lucifer acted as a simple bishop without extraordinary faculties, he could have given the orders, but he could not have given jurisdiction. He could have made Paulinus a bishop, but he could not have made him bishop of Antioch. It cannot, however, be supposed for a moment that Lucifer would have acted as he did unless special authority

from the church on account of the indulgence accorded to the repentant Arians. But though that sect unhappily took its name from Lucifer of Cagliari, it is by no means certain that he himself went so far, or that he was ever guilty of schism, or, if he fell into it at all, that he died in it. On the contrary, there have not been wanting grave authorities who maintained that Lucifer died not only in communion with the church, but even in the odour of sanctity. His life, with the express title of Saint applied to him, is found in the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum* of the 20th of May, from the pen of the learned Papebrochius. The controversy respecting his sanctity at one time grew so warm, particularly in the island of Sardinia, that, after the matter had been carefully considered by the Roman Inquisition, Pope Urban VIII. issued a decree, bearing date the 20th of June 1641, by which he formally prohibited anything further to be written either for or against the alleged sanctity of Lucifer, or that there should be any further public discussion respecting it in any way, under pain of excommunication *ipso facto*, until it should be otherwise ordained by the Holy Sec. The decree at the same time states explicitly that 'His Holiness does not intend thereby to declare or decide anything concerning the alleged sanctity of Lucifer, or in opposition to it, but he wishes it to remain in the state in which it is found.' For this decree, with further particulars, see the celebrated work of Benedict XIV., '*De Canonizatione*,' t. i. lib. i. cap. xl.

had been delegated to him by the Roman Pontiff. Otherwise the whole East would have called out in indignation against such unwarrantable interference on the part of an individual Western bishop in her principal and presiding diocese; and Rome would have loudly condemned and repudiated his conduct. Lucifer was blamed for his precipitancy, but there is no record of his having been even accused of an undue assumption of authority. For this reason, and others already referred to, it may be concluded that, however imprudent the conduct of Lucifer, he nevertheless validly and legitimately conferred upon Paulinus not only the episcopal order, but the episcopal jurisdiction also which appertained to the see of Antioch. It might, however, be questioned whether that jurisdiction was not affected by the intervening decision at Alexandria, and the conduct of Eusebius of Vercelli. There is no reason for supposing that the legatine powers of Eusebius were less ample or less general than those possessed by Lucifer; indeed, precedence is given to the name of Eusebius in the letter from the council to the Antiochians. Now Eusebius did not approve the consecration of Paulinus, and declined to communicate with him as bishop of Antioch. But he did not go so far as to repudiate him; he suspended his judgment, leaving the matter to be decided by a competent tribunal. So that the jurisdiction of Paulinus does not appear to have been interfered with, and yet the position of Meletius did not suffer detriment in consequence.

The position
of
Meletius.

By his bold profession of the faith of Nicæa, and consequent banishment immediately after his election to Antioch, Meletius had anticipated the conditions of the indulgence afterwards accorded by the Church, and had *virtually* placed himself in a position to lay claim to its benefits. But, through the undue haste of Lucifer, Paulinus was consecrated before Meletius had had the opportunity of *formally* availing himself of the indulgence, since the decrees of the council of Alexandria had not been promulgated. It would, however, have been manifestly unjust to have thrust Meletius out of the bishopric on this account, although on the other hand, the recognised Catholic position of the Eustathians rendered it impossible altogether to reject the claims of their newly-made bishop Paulinus. It cannot be assumed as certain that it was the intention of Lucifer to reject Meletius. Theodoret says that, in consequence of the opposition of the Eustathians to his proposals for the union of both parties, he consecrated Paulinus *for them* (ἐχειροτόνησεν αὐτοῖς). It is by no means impossible that he determined at any rate to provide a bishop for the Eustathians, leaving the rest an open question. However this may have been, the practical effect of the course adopted afterwards by Eusebius, was to leave the whole matter in abeyance, till a favourable opportunity should arise for a solution of the difficulty, without interfering in the meanwhile with the episcopal functions either of Meletius or Paulinus. By withholding his private communion from both, he

Eecl. Hist. iii. 5.

excluded neither of them, but he suspended judgment between them. He could not formally recognise them both, but he might tolerate the temporary continuance of a false position, which could not have been avoided without the danger of incurring a very much greater evil. This conduct on the part of St. Eusebius of Verecelli, constitutes one of the most important features of the history. It has been seen how highly he was esteemed by the Pope, and how important his presence in the council of Milan was considered to be, on all sides. He appears, as before said, to have been invested with delegated authority from Rome, at least equal to that of Lucifer; and he would certainly represent, far more truly than Lucifer, not only the views of Rome and of the West, but those also of St. Athanasius and of the bishops whom, together with him, he had so recently assembled in council in Alexandria. He had arrived at Antioch direct from that said memorable council, which has always been held in veneration by the Church. He had taken a leading part in its deliberations, whilst Lucifer was absent. He was thoroughly imbued with its spirit, and the course which he pursued may be looked upon as dictated by that spirit. It may, at the same time, be regarded as an indication of the judgment which would be formed upon the subject in the West. On his return to Italy it would be the duty of Eusebius to give an account of the whole matter to the Pope, and the subsequent conduct of the Roman See shows her

approval of his behaviour under these difficult circumstances. Rome in fact adopted the policy of Eusebius; prudently abstaining from forcing on a crisis, and so leaving time for the sweetly disposing hand of Providence to work the required changes. She appears to have considered that the exigencies of the case justified, in the meanwhile, the toleration of the anomaly of two rival Catholic bishops in the one See of Antioch, and therefore to have tacitly permitted each of them to exercise the power and the jurisdiction which belonged to that exalted bishopric. It is a striking instance of the maternal solicitude of the Church, not to scare away feeble Christians from her bosom through an over-rigorous enforcement of the letter of her laws, when mercy in some particular instance pleads that their spirit will be more truly fulfilled, if she tolerates a temporary suspension of their outward observance.

The labours of
St. Eusebius.

Soerat. iii. 9.
Sozom. v. 13.
Rufin. i. (x.) 30.

When Eusebius left Antioch he journeyed through the East, where, in the language of the ancient historians, he fulfilled the offices both of a good physician and a priest, receiving back the lapsed, strengthening the weak in faith, establishing and teaching the doctrines of the Church. He then proceeded to Illyricum, from which he passed to Italy, everywhere persevering in his unwearied labours for Christ. So highly was he esteemed that St. Jerome, in speaking of the liberation of the confessors from exile, says, ‘at the return of Eusebius, Italy put off her robes of mourning.’ . . .

Adv. Lucif. n. 19.

Tunc ad reditum Eusebii lugubres vestes Italia mutavit.

There appears to have been a delay in the return of St. Meletius from his place of exile, for he did not reach Antioch till Eusebius, having arrived there from Alexandria, was endeavouring in vain to unite the divided Catholic parties. When Meletius came back, he presided over the assemblies of his followers in the Palæa, outside the gates.

It seemed to me desirable to explain fully the origin and the first development of the lamentable division we are considering, but it would require the space of a separate volume to relate all the details of its subsequent history. I therefore confine myself, though reluctantly, to a short mention of a few of the most prominent events connected with it, till I arrive at the proof that St. Meletius died in acknowledged communion with Rome.

St. Meletius was thrice exiled from Antioch on account of the faith. His first exile, under Constantius, has already been described. It is equally certain that the third took place under Valens. But there is a difference of opinion respecting the date of the second. Tillemont thinks that he was twice banished by Valens. Father Bollandus, on the other hand, places the period of his second exile under the reign of Julian, soon after his return from the first, and this appears to be the most probable opinion, though in such case the second

The return
of
St. Meletius.

Soerat. iii. 9.
Sozom. v. 13.
Rufin. i. (x.) 30.

The three exiles
of
St. Meletius.

Note x. sur S. Melèce.
Acta Sanct. Feb. 12.

exile must have been very short in its duration, for St. Meletius was in Antioch in the year 363. It is said that he was then especially favoured by Julian's successor, the Emperor Jovian, who gave to him and to his followers the possession of a church which had been recently built at Antioch.

Council of Antioch,
A.D. 363.

An event occurred at this time which threw considerable suspicion upon the orthodoxy both of St. Meletius of Antioch and of St. Eusebius of Samosata. After the accession of Jovian to the imperial throne, Acacius of Cæsarea, with others of the same party, proposed to Meletius to unite with him in a public profession of the Nicene faith. They were probably desirous to comply with the conditions of the indulgence accorded by the Council of Alexandria to those who had been contaminated with Arianism. They may have been actuated by real conviction; but they have not escaped the imputation of the more unworthy motive of fear lest they should otherwise be driven from their sees. An orator of the day spoke of some who were worshippers not of God but of the Imperial purple, and who changed sides like the waters of the Euripus¹ under the influence of the tides. A council was accordingly held at Antioch, by which a letter was addressed to Jovian and signed by the assembled bishops, the signatures of Meletius and of Eusebius of Samosata being the foremost. This epistle has been preserved in the ecclesiastical history of Sozomen, as well as in that

Lib. vi. cap. 4.

¹ The Straits of Negropont.

of Socrates. It recited the Nicene symbol, and professed the adherence of its authors to the same. But it prefixed to the symbol an interpretation of the word *consubstantial* which did not adequately express the full Catholic doctrine on that most essential point; for it stated that the word *ὁμοούσιος*, ‘which appeared strange to many, had been safely interpreted by the fathers to signify that the Son was begotten from the substance of the Father, and that he is *of like* substance with the Father (*ὅμοιος κατ’ οὐσίαν τῷ πατρὶ*).’ This term of *similar in substance* (*ὁμοιούσιος*) was admitted by the Semiarrians and Macedonians, who rejected the blasphemous teaching that the Son of God was *different* (*ἀνόμοιος*) in substance from the Father, but would not consent to the Catholic dogma that He was of the *self-same* substance with the Father (*ὁμοούσιος*). This, no doubt, gave occasion for the statement recorded in the chronicle of St. Jerome (who appears to have been prejudiced against Meletius), that ‘a synod was held at Antioch by Meletius and his party, in which, rejecting the *homousion* and *anomæon*, they maintained the intermediate *homoiousion*, the Macedonian dogma.’ It can hardly be believed that such was really the intention of Meletius and Eusebius, both of whom are honoured by the Church for their noble defence of the Catholic faith, and their heroic sufferings in its behalf. Nor does the document in question contain a simple and unqualified affirmation of the *homoiousion*; on the contrary, it states, in conjunction with it, that the Son

Ep. de Synodis, n. 41. is begotten of the substance of the Father. St. Athanasius asserts that men who teach this are not to be looked upon as enemies, when they only hesitate as to the word *ὁμοούσιον*, but to be argued with as brothers who differ merely respecting the use of a term. For that those persons who confess the Son to be uncreated, of the substance of the Father, and One with Him from all eternity, are not far from accepting the word *ὁμοούσιος*.

It cannot however be denied, that the declaration of the Synod was insufficient, although it might be reconcilable with Catholic doctrine. It would naturally give rise to cavil on the part of those who were adverse to Meletius, and expose both St. Eusebius and himself to the danger of being considered as doubtful in their faith, by Catholics at a distance who were imperfectly acquainted with the facts. That these great men were in reality misunderstood or misrepresented in consequence, is rendered still further evident by a document to be found amongst the works of St. Athanasius, entitled, ‘A refutation by our holy father Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, of the hypocrisy of Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata and their party, concerning the homousion.’ The attribution of its authorship to St. Athanasius is considered to be an error, but it is thought that it was written by some other person in the year 364, immediately after the synod at Antioch. It contains no mention of the names of Meletius and Eusebius, or of any others, excepting in the title,

but it argues against the *homoiousion* as opposed in meaning to *consubstantial*. The word was undoubtedly objectionable, because open to such an interpretation; but there is no shadow of a proof that the two holy bishops, who are so unreservedly charged with hypocrisy in the title of the aforesaid document, ever intended their language to convey two meanings, or to be understood in a sense which was not perfectly in accordance with the Catholic faith of Nicæa.

By this profession of the Nicene faith Meletius formally complied with the requirements of the Alexandrian Council, if he had not previously done so. But the above-mentioned accusations were calculated greatly to retard the action of Rome and the West in his favour.

In fact, it is evident from one of the epistles of St. Basil that these accusations reached the ears of the Pope. In the year 377, when St. Basil's messenger Dorotheus was in Rome, and was urging the claims of St. Meletius; Peter, the Archbishop of Alexandria, the immediate successor of St. Athanasius, was also in that city, having taken refuge there from the violence of the governor of Alexandria. In the presence of the Pope St. Damasus, and of the above-named Dorotheus, Archbishop Peter denounced Meletius and Eusebius as members of the Arian faction. Dorotheus replied in terms of so great warmth that the Archbishop complained of it to St. Basil, who, in the epistle referred to, expressed his deep regret that such should have been the case. At the same time, he strongly vindic-

Charge of heresy
against
St. Meletius
and
St. Eusebius of
Samosata.
S. Basili
Ep. cclxvi. 2.
Theod. iv. 21.

ated the orthodoxy of Meletius and Eusebius, appealing in evidence of the same to the persecutions which they had endured from the Arians, and calling God and his own ears to witness, that there was no word of true doctrine which he had not heard those men most freely proclaim; and he added, that he would not have admitted their communion for an hour, if he had found them halting in the faith.

Interchange
of
communication
between
St. Meletius
and
Rome.

This happened on the occasion of one of the many embassies despatched by St. Basil with a view to induce the Pope to send bishops to the East, in order to restore ecclesiastical discipline and peace in those distracted regions. St. Meletius also took a leading part in these embassies, as occupier of the principal See amongst the churches in the East, and it was one of his deacons who, in the first instance, was charged with the management of the business in Rome. Messengers were also sent from Rome to St. Meletius and the Eastern bishops. On both sides they were received, and the title 'brother' was bestowed on them in the formal documents. In all these transactions there is no sign whatever of any formal interruption of communion.

Evagrius
of
Antioch.
S. Basilii Ep. clvi.

Tillemont,
Vic de
S. Basil le Grand,
Art. ci.

An instance in point occurs in the case of the priest Evagrius of Antioch, if the words which St. Basil addressed to him in one of his epistles have been rightly understood. Evagrius had accompanied St. Eusebius of Vercelli on his return to the West in the year 363 or 364, and had done good service in the Catholic cause. About the autumn of the year 373

he returned to the East, and brought back to St. Basil from Rome certain papers which had been sent there by the Orientals. He requested another letter in their place, since they had not given entire satisfaction to those who were most strict amongst the Westerns. Evagrius suggested also an embassy of more important persons than had hitherto been sent, to solicit a visitation from the West. He conferred with St. Basil respecting the affairs of Antioch, but on his arrival in that city he did not join the communion of Meletius. In the letter above referred to, St. Basil expressed his sorrow at having learnt this, and observed that, if he remembered aright, it was not the same course which they had talked of when together. *Καίτοι οὐ τοιαῦτα ἡμῖν ἦν τὰ ὠμιλημένα, εἴ τι ἐγὼ μέμνημαι.* From this remark it is reasonably inferred that Evagrius, before leaving St. Basil, had expressed to him his intention to communicate in Antioch with St. Meletius; and although he afterwards joined Paulinus and became his successor in the episcopate, yet it is evident that if Meletius had been formally separated from the Roman communion, the devoted Catholic Evagrius newly arrived from Rome and Italy, and entrusted with a message by the Westerns, must necessarily have been aware of the fact, and could not under such circumstances have hesitated as to which of the two communions he would join, or have held out any expectations to St. Basil that he would unite himself to Meletius.

It is also to be observed that, notwithstanding his

Ep. clvi. disappointment, St. Basil in the same letter addresses Evagrius as ‘a brother truly most religious and much desired by us (ἀληθῶς εὐλαβέστατος καὶ πολυπόθητος ἡμῶν ἀδελφε).’

S. Bas. Ep. ccxiv. 2. In a subsequent epistle to Count Terence, St. Basil speaks of Paulinus and his followers, as belonging to those ‘of the household of the faith’ with whom especially he desires to be in charity.

It cannot be supposed that St. Basil would in either case have used such language, if he had not considered both of the mutually divided Catholic parties in Antioch, to have been united in visible communion with Rome and the universal church.

Paulinus makes a profession of his faith. The orthodoxy of Paulinus was called in question, as well as that of Meletius, but he abundantly refuted the early accusations against him, by subscribing a profession of faith which, according to St. Epiphanius, was written by the hand of St. Athanasius himself, and which is appended to the before-mentioned synodical letter from the Council of Alexandria to the Antiochians.

Later accusations against Paulinus. Ep. cclxiii. 5. Some fourteen years afterwards, A.D. 377, in one of the epistles from the Eastern to the Western bishops contained in the works of St. Basil, it is observed that the Westerns themselves could say whether there had been anything reprehensible concerning the ordination of Paulinus,¹ but that the writers of the epistle

¹ From this remark it may be perceived that the Easterns did not call in question the jurisdiction of the Roman See over that of Antioch, but left the point to its decision.

bewailed his propensity for the doctrine of Marcellus, and the fact that he admitted the followers of Marcellus indiscriminately to his communion. Now Marcellus had been declared free from all imputation of heresy, both by Pope Julius I. and the Council of Sardica; and though certain of his disciples proved to be less orthodox, it does not appear whether there was sufficient foundation for accusing Paulinus of participation in their error. In those days, however, such accusations abounded on all sides, and even the great St. Basil did not escape without suffering his share of calumny. Nor can it fail to be observed, that Rome was the central authority to which all the disputants appealed. It was the earnest desire of St. Basil, and an object of his strenuous efforts, to persuade Rome to send over a commission to regulate the affairs of the East.

To return once more to the days of Athanasius. Shortly after that great saint had been recalled to his see by the newly elected Emperor Jovian, in a letter expressive of admiration, he undertook the journey from Alexandria to Antioch to confer with Jovian on the affairs of the church, prompted by his zeal, and, perhaps, also urged by a request from the emperor, who testified his satisfaction upon his arrival by the marks of esteem and affection with which he received him. It has already been stated that Jovian is said to have been friendly to Meletius; and it is mentioned in one of the letters of St. Basil, that Athanasius ‘wholly desired to be reconciled

Glaire,
Diet. des Sciences
Eclési.
Art. Marcell,
Évêque d'Ancyro.

St. Athanasius
and
St. Meletius.

Ep. cclviii.

in communion' with Meletius, apparently on this occasion, but that through the fault of advisers their union was deferred to another season. 'Would that it had not been so!' adds St. Basil; but he does not state the reason of the postponement. In another

Epist. lxxxix. n. 2. of his epistles he mentions a certain bishop, called Athanasius, whom the Meletians dismissed without their communion. It has been thought that the bishop thus alluded to was the same St. Athanasius the Great; and Cardinal Orsi concludes that St. Athanasius must have required conditions to which the Meletians would not accede. Tillemont, however, thinks that it must have been another Athanasius who was dismissed without communion by the Meletians. He says that the idea of Meletius having rejected the communion of St. Athanasius of Alexandria, 'is so strangely opposed both to the piety and to all the interests of St. Meletius, that' the occurrence spoken of by St. Basil, 'may be better understood of an Athanasius who had been engaged in the error, and the party of the Macedonians.' This explanation, however, does not satisfactorily agree with the tenor of St. Basil's epistle last referred to.

In any case the person spoken of in his previously mentioned letter is plainly St. Athanasius the Great, and the willingness of one so highly esteemed at Rome to communicate with St. Meletius, forms an important feature in the history of this transaction.

Perhaps it should have been previously remarked that there were different degrees of excommunication

Istoria Eccles.
lib. 17, ix.

Hist. Ecclés.
St.-Meléec, art. ix.

Different degrees
of
interruption

in the early church. In the case of individuals there was the *excommunicatio mortalis*, now called *major*, which involved entire separation from the church; and there was the *excommunicatio medicinalis*, now called *minor*, which was simply a suspension of the use of the sacraments, and sometimes also of public participation in the prayers of the faithful, in which case the penitent took his place with the catechumens. This did not involve separation from the church; and of this nature was the interruption of communion which sometimes arose between one bishop and another, or one local church and another. It was a mutual division, which did not involve any ecclesiastical censure, provided there was no ecclesiastical superiority on either side.¹

The division between St. Athanasius and Meletius, and that between St. Basil and Paulinus, appertained

of
Ecclesiastical
communion.
Devoti Instit. Canon.
Lib. iv. Tit. xviii.
§§ 4, 5, 6, 7.
T. iv. pp. 180-183.
Ed. Romana 7^{ma} 1829.

¹ I state this on the authority of the Instit. Canon. of Devoti, a work published and approved in Rome. He says (*ubi supra*, § 5): ‘Erat enim medicinalis, aut minoris excommunicationis loco illa unius Episcopi, aut Ecclesie, ab alio Episcopo, Ecclesiaque separatio, per quam fiebat, ut duo Episcopi inter se neque darent, neque acciperent literas formatas, neque alter alterius ab se separata Ecclesie filios ad communionem admitteret. Hujusmodi excommunicatio locum habebat, si aliqua Ecclesia, aut Episcopus aliam Ecclesiam in fidem, aut in disciplinam peccare intelligeret. Sed mutua hæc excommunicatio, si Ecclesie sibi invicem subjectæ non essent, proprie ecclesiastica censura non erat, sed tantum erat divisio, et separatio communionis, quam una Ecclesia alteri, cui non subesset, denegare poterat.’ He refers, as an instance, to St. Epiphanius (Epist. ad Joan. Episc. Hierosol.), who rejected the communion of John, Bishop of Jerusalem, because he understood that he defended the errors of Origen.

only to the lesser of the above-named degrees. In the case of a church which had jurisdiction over another, as Rome over Antioch and universally, it would naturally rest with the superior church to extend the excommunication or to limit it at discretion. If Rome in any degree withheld her communion from Meletius at the period in question, of which I have found no sufficient evidence, it could only have been in the lesser degree, not to the extent of complete separation from the body of the faithful. It is needless to observe, that such a case is very different in its nature from that of the consummated and complete separation which exists between Rome and the established Church of England.

St. Basil
held strongly
to
St. Meletius.

The letter which mentions the desire of St. Athanasius to be reconciled with Meletius, was written by St. Basil to St. Epiphanius, and it contains remarks which assist to the better understanding of the position of the two divided Catholic parties in Antioch and their upholders. I therefore subjoin the whole paragraph, with the exception of the last sentence, which has reference to the *Hypostases*:—

St. Bas. Ep. cclviii. 3. ‘But, as regards the church at Antioch, that I say which agrees in the same doctrine, may the Lord grant that we may sometime see it united. For it stands in especial danger from the snares of the enemy, who bears ill-will to it because there first was established the title of Christian. And indeed heresy is divided against orthodoxy, and orthodoxy also is divided against itself. But for us the most reverend Meletius is bishop, since he first boldly defended the truth and fought that good fight in the times

of Constantius, and my church has always held to his communion, having loved him above measure, on account of that strong and unconquered firmness. By the grace of God we hold his communion till now, and, if God will, we will continue to hold it. For also the most blessed Pope Athanasius, when he came from Alexandria, altogether wished to be reconciled in communion with him, but through the wickedness of counsellors their union was put off to another season, which I wish had not been the case. But we have never yet held communion with any of those who came after, not because we accounted them unworthy, but because we had no reason for condemning the other. We have heard indeed many things from the brethren, but we do not give credit to them because the accused do not stand before the accusers, as it is written: *Our law does not judge any man, unless it first hears him and knows what he doth.* Wherefore we cannot send letters to them' (meaning to Paulinus and his followers), 'most honourable brother, nor ought we to be compelled thereto. But it would be fitting to your peaceful proposal, not to unite with one and divide with the other, but to bring those who are divided to their former union. Wherefore, first beseech, and then so far as you are able exhort, that casting away ambition from their souls, they may be reconciled with one another, in order both to restore strength to the church, and to repress the fury of her enemies.'

St. John vii. 51.

If Meletius had been out of communion with Rome, it is impossible that St. Basil should have so warmly espoused and held to his communion without sharing in the same excommunication. St. Epiphanius held to the communion of Paulinus, and it would seem from the above letter that he had endeavoured to persuade St. Basil to join it. St. Basil

There was
no interruption
of
communion
between the friends
of
each party.

decidedly declines, but not in such a manner as to imply that he regarded Paulinus and his followers as out of the church. Nor did the fact of their holding respectively to the two opposite Catholic communions in Antioch, occasion any rupture between St. Basil and St. Epiphanius. Indeed, the whole of the passage which has been quoted shows plainly, that the dissension was regarded as merely local and internal. Can it be conceived that two eminent Roman Catholic Bishops, such as St. Basil and St. Epiphanius, would in like manner differ in their views, and exchange friendly communication respecting their difference, as regards the relative position of the Roman and Anglican communions in this country? Such an occurrence would be impossible; but such difference and such communication actually occurred in the case of Antioch, because neither Meletius nor Paulinus was formally severed from Rome and the universal church, as is the case with the Anglican communion.

The object
of
St. Basil.

Ep. lxxvi. 2.

St. Basil considered that the first step towards healing the disorders of the East was to strive for the restoration of concord to the divided church of Antioch, so that, to use his own words, that church, like a head which had been strengthened, might supply health to the whole body. He desired to accomplish this end by the union of all parties under Meletius. This was his object from the very first, and, in the year 372, he had written to urge St. Athanasius to assist him in his application to pro-

cure the interference of Rome for the purpose. He said at that time that Meletius in reality presided over, so to speak, the whole body of the church in Antioch; that the others were, as it were, segments of parts, and that they ought to be joined to Meletius like small rivers to great, being treated in a becoming manner, and the people being pacified. He added that St. Athanasius was aware such a course 'was pleasing to his friends of one soul (*ἑμοψύχοις*) in the West, as the letters brought by the blessed Sylvanus to the Easterns made manifest.' We possess no further information respecting these letters; but whatever may have been the disposition of Rome (which in the present instance is synonymous with the West) at the period referred to by St. Basil, it is plain that she would not subsequently consent to the exclusion of the claims of Paulinus, though I cannot find sufficient ground for believing that she ever regarded Meletius and his followers as out of her communion. The commonly received opinion that at one time she did so, may in great measure have arisen from a circumstance which will be found, upon examination, to give no sufficient warrant for such a conclusion.

The circumstance to which I allude drew forth from St. Basil a letter to Count Terence, to which is assigned the date A.D. 375; and it is from this letter chiefly that the circumstances have become known. St. Basil states therein that a rumour has reached him that the followers of Paulinus were carrying about

Ep. lxvii.

Paulinus
receives letters
from
the West.
S. Bas. Ep. cexiv.

letters which they had received from the West, and which attributed the episcopate of the church of Antioch to Paulinus, setting aside ‘Meletius, the most admirable bishop of the true church of God.’ He says he is not surprised at this, since the Westerns were misinformed as to the real position of affairs in the East. He then refers to a letter written to Paulinus by St. Athanasius the Great, which, as he appears to think, influenced the conduct of the Western bishops, and he says it is not unlikely that the persons from whom they derived their information ‘either were ignorant of the true state of the case, or even concealed the reason through which the most blessed Bishop Athanasius came to write to Paulinus.’ St. Basil does not mention that reason, but St. Epiphanius informs us that the profession of faith already mentioned, which Paulinus had produced to him in reply to the charge of Sabellianism, and which he has recorded verbatim, had been previously made by Paulinus to St. Athanasius as his justification, ἀπολογίας χάριν; and Tillemont concludes that this may have been the occasion on which St. Athanasius wrote the letter referred to by St. Basil, and which he seems to imply had been unduly used by certain parties, as an argument with the Westerns in behalf of Paulinus.

St. Basil further requests Count Terence, who was a person of influence, to inform himself respecting what had been done in Antioch by the bishops in the reign of Jovian. It may be that this remark was prompted by the imputations of heresy against Mele-

St. Athanasius
addressed a letter
to
Paulinus.

See above, p. 308.

Adv. hæer.
lxxvii. nn. 20, 21.

St. Athanasie,
art. 103.

St. Basil
defends the position
of
St. Meletius.

tius which arose out of that transaction, as has already been noticed, and from which St. Basil would be desirous that St. Meletius should be cleared; or it may be that he appealed to the said council as being a formal profession of the Nicene faith, and such as would entitle St. Meletius to the indulgence accorded in the year 362 in Alexandria, as before mentioned. He then congratulates Paulinus and his followers on having received letters from Rome, observing that he accuses no man, yea desires to maintain charity with all, especially with those of the household of faith, and expressing his hopes that the great and honourable testimony those letters bear to them is true, and confirmed by their works. But, he adds, that he cannot on that account ever be persuaded to ignore Meletius or forget the church over which he presides, or to consider the questions from which the dissension first arose as trifling and of little moment to religion. For, he says, if any one not sound in the faith should be puffed up by an epistle not only from men but from heaven, he could not on that account consider him as a partaker of the communion of the Saints, unless he professed sound doctrine. These remarks perhaps allude to the question of the *Hypostases*, of which St. Basil proceeds to treat in the same letter, and which, under the circumstances of the times, he appears both here and elsewhere to have regarded as of greater importance than it had been considered by the fathers in Alexandria, A.D. 362. It will have been observed that in a

See above, p. 301, &c.

See above,
pp. 288, 289.

previous sentence, St. Basil had spoken of Paulinus and his followers as of the household of faith. Consequently the language which he afterwards used can hardly have been intended in its literal sense, if it is meant to apply to the same persons.

This letter from St. Basil was written as soon as he had learnt the report to which it refers; and before he appears to have had an opportunity of examining the letters from the West. It would not therefore be surprising if the tenor of the said letters was exaggerated, in the rumour through which St. Basil was informed of them.

St. Basil wrote also to St. Meletius informing him that he had received letters, from which he learnt that letters had been brought to Paulinus from the West, as signs of a certain priority (*ὡσπερ τινὸς ἀρχῆς συνήματα*), and that the leaders of that party were much elated and gloried in the said letters, so as to propose a form of faith, and express their readiness on its acceptance to be united with the other side. He adds that he also heard that the most excellent man Terence had been led away by them to take their part, and that he had quickly written to him restraining his haste, and informing him of their fraud. As has been seen, he considered Rome to have been misinformed respecting the facts.

There is extant a letter of Pope St. Damasus to Paulinus in reference to the reception of Vitalis to his communion, which alludes to a former letter sent to him by means of the same Vitalis, and to a

Letter of
St. Basil
to
St. Meletius.
Ep. cexvi.

See above, p. 316.

The only letter extant
from
St. Damasus to
Paulinus.
Constant,
Ep. Pontif. Roman.
coll. 507 &c.

subsequent short message or letter sent through one Petronius, a priest, expressing some uneasiness in reference to Vitalis. We know of no other communications from the West to Paulinus during the lifetime of Meletius than these, about the year 375. Dom. Coustant gives only the latest of them, so that the others seem to have been lost. The one he publishes contains an evident recognition of the communion of Paulinus, speaking of union with him as being union with Rome; but it does not exclude the communion of Meletius, unless one of the clauses in the exposition of faith which it contains, must be construed as directed against him.

The said clause declares that Rome holds all those who have migrated from one diocese to another, as alien to her communion, until they return to their own diocese, and that if a successor in the meantime has been appointed, the one who has migrated shall be without the sacerdotal dignity, so long as the said successor survives. It is certain that Meletius was Bishop of Sebaste before his elevation to the See of Antioch, but it is not so certain that his promotion to Antioch could be considered as a migration, since Theodoret intimates that he had resigned the See of Sebaste, and was residing privately at Berœa when elected to Antioch. The causes for his resignation may have been sufficient to excuse it; so that, even if the canon of the church had been, strictly speaking, violated, his case may still have formed a justifiable exception. It is to be observed that St. Damasus does not enter

Clause
respecting the
change of
benefices.

upon these considerations. He simply re-affirms an established canon of the Church, leaving it entirely an open question as to whether it applied to Meletius or not. Moreover, the clause is so abruptly introduced, and has so little to do with the context which precedes and follows it, as to wear the appearance of an interpolation, though it cannot be proved that it is so.

Why the letters
were addressed
to
Paulinus.

There was a manifest reason why the affair of Vitalis should have been referred by the Pope to Paulinus rather than to Meletius. Vitalis had been a disciple of Meletius, and had left him, as will be explained. It would therefore not be through Meletius that he would seek admission to the Roman communion. However, he was attempting to deceive, and he does not seem to have complied with the conditions which the Pope required from him through Paulinus.

The manner
in which the
letters
were received
indicates
the uncertainty
of
the position.

But whilst there is no sufficient ground for regarding this communication as excluding Meletius from the Roman communion, it would appear from the triumph of the followers of Paulinus, that this was the first occasion on which Rome had thus formally recognised their position. This is an important consideration, for some thirteen years had then passed since the first consecration of Paulinus. Yet his followers were elated at the reception of these letters, as at something which was new; and St. Basil, the friend of Meletius, was disappointed. Let the analogy between Antioch and England be tested by this fact. Is there any unusual elation amongst the spiritual subjects of the Archbishop of Westminster when he

receives an official communication from Rome? Is the Anglican communion on the other hand, in any way disappointed thereat? Does it in any way lay claim to, or expect, a like recognition?

It is plain that if the communion of Paulinus had been known as the communion solely recognised by Rome, and that of Meletius had been known to have been excluded by her, the Pope's letters which have been spoken of, could not have given rise to any elation in the former, nor have caused any disappointment to the friends of the rival Catholic bishop. It must further be borne in mind, that whilst this is the first occasion on which we have evidence of any direct communication between Rome and the communion of Paulinus, we find Meletius and his friends in direct communication with Rome, interchanging epistles and embassies with the West, both before and after this event, on matters connected with the faith, and the ecclesiastical affairs of the East.

Thus, the exultation of the followers of Paulinus on the receipt of these letters, and their eagerness to interpret them as adverse to Meletius, betray the fact of their uncertainty as to their actual position. Excepting in reference to the reports connected with the said letters, which he does not appear to have seen when he wrote, St. Basil nowhere intimates that Rome had disavowed the position of Meletius; but he would not himself rest contented without the exclusive recognition of Meletius as sole bishop of Antioch, and the union of both sides under him

as such. This was the end for which, as has been said, he wrote and laboured; whilst on the other hand, Rome and the West, though they did not formally reject Meletius, held communion at the same time with Paulinus and his party.

Vitalis
of
Antioch.

Sozomen, Hist. Eccl.
vi. 25.

Vitalis, above mentioned, had been one of the priests under Meletius, and remarkable both for his well-regulated life and for the diligence with which he fulfilled the duties of his pastoral charge. It is said that he took offence at being refused access to the bishop by his fellow presbyter, Flavian. He left Meletius, drawing many persons after him, and, attaching himself to Apollinaris, became involved with him in heresy. He was ultimately consecrated by Apollinaris as bishop of his sect in Antioch. This defection of Vitalis, and the leading position which he assumed, created another centre of division in the city, which now contained four different sections of Christians, two of which were Catholic. Euzoius and his party were notoriously Arian; but the heresy of Vitalis was not so generally known, at least not for some time. By means of a verbally orthodox profession of faith, which he privately interpreted in an heretical sense, he succeeded for a while in deceiving Pope St. Damasus, and also St. Gregory Nazianzen, but the fraud was afterwards discovered.

Adv. Hæreses, 77,
un. 20, 22, 23.

St. Epiphanius speaks in high terms of the life and habits of Vitalis, with whom he conversed when he visited Antioch; and it was not until after a series of questionings, which the saint has recorded, that

Vitalis avowed to him, and maintained by argument, the heretical tenet that the Godhead occupied the place of a human mind in the person of Jesus Christ. Vitalis professed to be in communion with the Roman See. This is evident from the letters of St. Jerome to the Pope St. Damasus, in which he implores to be informed with which of the three he is to hold communion, Vitalis, Meletius, or Paulinus. He does not mention Euzoius or his party, since they notoriously belonged to the Arians.

These letters afford so striking and unanswerable a testimony to the doctrine of St. Jerome respecting the necessity of communion with Rome, and respecting her office as guardian of the faith, that they deserve very special attention.

Amidst the deserts of Syria, in his penitential retirement, St. Jerome was disturbed and harassed by the surrounding dissensions, and the contention respecting the *hypostases*. Finding it hard, he says, to ascertain which is the true Church of Christ in those regions, and to discern the fountain which is sealed from the broken cisterns which have no water, he has determined 'to consult the chair of Peter, and the faith which was praised by the mouth of an apostle; now asking food for my soul from thence, whence formerly I received the clothing of Christ.' He thus urges the fact of his having been baptized in Rome as an enhancement of his claim upon the Pope for a reply; but the context proves beyond a doubt, that his motive in consulting St. Damasus was

Testimony of
St. Jerome
to the authority
of the
Roman See.

Epist. xv. n. 1,
ed. Veron. 1734.

Ibid. n. 2.

derived from his faith in the divinely constituted office and authority of the Roman See. 'I,' he says, 'following no chief but Christ, am united in the communion of your blessedness, that is, of the chair of Peter. Upon that rock I know that the Church is built. Whosoever shall eat the lamb outside this house is profane. If anyone be not in the ark of Noe, he shall perish when the deluge prevails. . . . Here I follow your colleagues, the Egyptian confessors, and beneath those laden vessels I lie hid in a little skiff. I know not Vitalis; I reject Meletius; I am a stranger to Paulinus. Whosoever gathereth not with thee scattereth; that is, whoso is not Christ's is Antichrist's.'

Ibid. n. 4.

He then enters on the question of the *hypostases*; and, though he contends most strongly that only one ought to be professed, he submits the matter unreservedly to the judgment of the Pope. 'Decree it, I beseech you,' he says, 'if it be your pleasure, and I will not fear to confess three hypostases. If you command it, let a new post-Nicene faith be made, and let the orthodox make use of the same words as the Arians.' This language is so strong that it might have been regarded as ironical, if the sequel had not shown it to be intended in its literal sense. 'If it be your pleasure,' proceeds St. Jerome, in the same paragraph, after further argument in behalf of his opinion; 'if it be your pleasure, let there be silence respecting three hypostases, and let one be maintained. . . . But if you think it right that we ought to confess

three hypostases with their interpretations, we refuse not. But believe me, there lurks poison under the honey, &c.'

He concludes :—'Wherefore I conjure your blessedness by the crucified Saviour of the world, by the consubstantial Trinity, that authority may be given me by your letters either to be silent respecting the hypostases or to confess them. . . . Also, that you will signify to me at the same time with whom I ought to communicate in Antioch.'

Ibid. n. 5.

The question of the *hypostases* did not regard the subject of the faith itself, but only the mode of expressing it. Still, the form of expression affected the safe keeping of the faith, and it could only therefore be determined by the competent authority to whom the guardianship of that faith had been entrusted by God.

St. Jerome's opinion on the question was strong and decided. Yet he professed his unreserved submission of the matter to the Roman See, in language which would be exclaimed against as extreme if it came from the pen of a modern Roman Catholic. There cannot then be the shadow of a doubt, that this great and free-spoken doctor of the church looked up to the Apostolic See of Rome, as the divinely constituted guardian of the faith.

He afterwards wrote again to Damasus, earnestly beseeching him to say with which of the three he was to communicate in Antioch. He reminds him how the importunate woman in the Gospel at last deserved

Epist. xvi. n. 1.

to be heard, and how the friend who knocked at the door at midnight, at last obtained the loaves he asked for; how God was overcome by the prayers of the publican, and Ninive was saved by tears; how Christ gave Paradise to the penitent thief, embraced the returning prodigal, bore the recovered sheep upon his shoulders, and turned the persecutor Paul into a preacher. 'This he does,' he says, 'that the great may look upon the small, and the rich pastor not despise the sheep that is sick.' He remarks, as in his former letter, that it was in Rome he first put on the garments of Christ; and he says, that he has sought the barbarous boundary of Syria in penance. But he complains that his incessant enemy has followed him even there, so that he suffers still greater conflicts in his solitude. 'For here,' he says, 'the Arian fury rages, supported by the protection of the world. Here the Church split into three parts is eager to draw me to itself. The ancient authority of the monks who dwell around rises up upon me. I, meanwhile, exclaim, if anyone be joined to the chair of Peter, he is mine. Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus say that they adhere to you; if only one of them asserted this, I could believe him. But now, either two of them speak falsely or all of them. Therefore I conjure your blessedness, by the cross of the Lord, by the necessary glory of our faith, the passion of Christ, that you who succeed to the apostles in honour, will succeed to them also in merit; so may you sit with the Twelve on the throne of judgment; so when old may another gird you with

Ibid. n. 2.

Peter ; so with Paul may you obtain the citizenship of heaven ; as by your letters you shall signify to me with whom I ought to communicate in Syria. Do not despise a soul for whom Christ died.'

There is no existing record of the reply of St. Damasus ; but St. Jerome was afterwards ordained priest by Paulinus, and became his ardent friend and admirer.

The fraud of Vitalis has already been spoken of, and there was, unquestionably, no genuine foundation for his profession of communion with Rome. But it is hardly credible that a bishop so holy and great as Meletius, would have made a similar assertion in his own case if it had not been true.

The letters above quoted must have been written by St. Jerome before the death of the heretical Emperor Valens, which occurred A.D. 378, for they refer to the protection afforded by him to 'the Arian madness.'

Date
of the above
letters.

'May Valens be burnt alive!'—Such was the customary malediction of the people on that emperor whilst he was in Antioch ; and so it came to pass, according to the more generally received opinion. Having been wounded by an arrow in the battle which he lost against the Goths at Adrianople, it is said that he was carried into the house of a peasant ; that the barbarians set fire to it without knowing that the Emperor was inside ; and that there he perished miserably in the flames, together

The death
of
Valens,
and
consequent recall
of
St. Meletius.
Tillemont,
Hist. des Emp.
Valens, Art. xx.

with all around him save one youth, who escaped alone to tell the tale. The historian, Orosius, calls attention to the just judgment of God, who thus punished Valens through those same Goths whom he had infected with the Arian heresy.

The emperor Gratian, who had hitherto only exercised government over the West, now succeeded Valens in that of the East, and one of his first acts was the release of the exiled Catholic Bishops. Meletius accordingly returned to Antioch, where he was received with acclamations of delight by the people. 'All the city,' says St. John Chrysostom, 'went forth to meet him. Some indeed drew near and seized his feet, and kissed his hands, and heard his voice; but others, hindered by the multitude, only beholding him, went back contented, as if they had received a sufficient blessing from his aspect, and possessed no less than those who had been near; and what was done in the Apostles happened also in him. For as with the Apostles, in the case of those who could not go forward and draw nearer, when their shadow was extended and touched them being afar off, they drew from it the same grace, and went away in like manner healed; so now, also, those who could not approach, perceiving, as it were, a certain spiritual glory emitted from that holy head, and reaching even to those who were furthest off, all likewise departed from him filled with all benediction from his aspect alone.'

Gratian
recalls the exiled
Catholic Bishops
in
the East.
Tillemont,
Emp. Gratien, Art. viii.

In laudem
S. Meletii.
Bolland. Act. SS.
xii. Feb.

The question
of

It is usually supposed that shortly after the return

of Meletius on this occasion, a compact was entered into between himself and Paulinus, whereby it was agreed that they should both continue to govern as Bishops in Antioch; but that, when one or the other of them should depart to the Lord, the survivor should have the sole charge of the whole church of Antioch, both the divided Catholic bodies being united under his rule. It does not, however, appear by any means certain that such an agreement was actually concluded.

the compact
between
Meletius & Paulinus.

According to Theodoret, Meletius proposed the above arrangement to Paulinus, but did not succeed in obtaining his consent. On the other hand, it is stated by Socrates and Sozomen that an agreement was made, and confirmed by oath, for the survivor to succeed to the sole episcopate. Both of these last named writers give substantially, and almost verbally, the same account. I subjoin the words of the former:—

Ecel. Hist. iv. 3.

Soc. Ecel. Hist. v. 5.
Sozom. Ecel. Hist.
vii. 3.

‘At the same time there was a serious contention at Antioch, in Syria, on account of Meletius. We have before said that Paulinus, the Bishop of Antioch, because of his exceeding sanctity, was not sent into exile. But Meletius, after his recall by Julian, having again been banished by Valens, was lastly recalled by Gratian; and when he arrived at Antioch he found Paulinus grown old. All his followers, therefore, immediately endeavoured that Meletius should occupy the episcopal throne together with Paulinus. But when Paulinus said that it was contrary to the canons to admit to the same chair one who had been consecrated by the Arians, the people employed force, and caused Meletius to be enthroned in one of the churches outside the city. When

this was done there arose much contention. But afterwards the people came to agreement on mutual conditions. Assembling those likely to be chosen for the episcopate, they found the number in all to be six, amongst whom was also Flavian. These they bound by oath not to aim at the episcopate when either of the two bishops should die,' (and, Sozomen adds, 'not to accept it if elected by others,') 'but to permit the survivor to occupy the throne of the one who was deceased. The oaths being thus made, the people became unanimous, and were no longer divided from one another.'

It is difficult to discern which account is most worthy of credit. The passage previously quoted from the sermon of St. Gregory Nazianzen 'on the agreement,' may be cited as evidence that some compact must have been entered into. On the other hand, the priest Flavian, who is named as having been one of those who took the oath, was actually consecrated bishop on the decease of St. Meletius, during the lifetime of Paulinus; and, since he was a person of distinguished piety, it is not easy to believe that he would have fallen into the guilt of perjury. It is also very remarkable, if such a compact really existed, that it should not in any way have been referred to by the same St. Gregory Nazianzen, in the account which he has left us of his very decided opposition to the said election of Flavian.¹

Carmen de Vita sua,
vv. 1585, &c.
pp. 758, &c., tom. ii.
Ed. Caillau, Par. 1842.

¹ It may be remarked, that the passage in St. Gregory's writings here referred to, and its context, contain several observations in reference to the want of concord between the East and the West, but nothing which could legitimately be construed as indicative of any positive interruption of ecclesiastical communion.

Yet we find a similar compact alluded to in one of the epistles addressed by the council of Aquileia to the emperors, A.D. 381. It is therein stated that the Western bishops had received letters from those 'who differed in the Church of Antioch;' and that, but for the disturbed state of the times, they would have sent a commission to endeavour to heal the division, but, since they were prevented, they say they have asked of the emperor that, *according to the agreement of the parties*, when one of the bishops dies, the churches may remain in the hands of the survivor, and no further ordination may be attempted. *Juxta partium pactum poposcimus, ut altero decedente penes superstitem ecclesie permanerent, nec aliqua superordinatio attentaretur.* This evidence might be regarded as conclusive, excepting that it is quite possible the Westerns may have been mistaken in supposing that the proposal made by Meletius had been accepted by Paulinus.

Labbe et Cossart,
Concil. i. col. 839.
Paris, 1715.

We are not in possession of information which will satisfactorily solve the difficulty, and it is therefore impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion respecting the fact. But it is of more importance to the question before us to observe, that we have positive and undeniable evidence, both in the above cited document, and in another letter to be referred to, that Rome was agreeable to a similar compact. This certainly would not have been the case, if either Meletius or Paulinus had been absolutely out of her communion. It is plain that the Western bishops

A similar arrange-
ment was
recommended
by the
Western bishops.

expressed their desire, and strongly recommended, that such an arrangement should be made. For besides the above document, there is extant a letter addressed to the Emperor Theodosius by 'St. Ambrose and other bishops of Italy,' in which they introduce their complaint of the appointment of a successor to Meletius after his decease, whilst Paulinus was still alive, as follows :—

S. Ambros. Epist.
xiii. 2.

'We had written,' they say, 'not long ago that since the city of Antioch had two bishops, Paulinus and Meletius, whom we accounted to be of one accord in the faith, either peace and concord should be agreed to between the same, without detriment to ecclesiastical order ; or certainly, in case of the decease of either of them whilst the other survived, no election should be made in place of the defunct during the lifetime of the other.'

'Scripseramus dudum, ut quoniam Antiochena civitas duos haberet episcopos, Paulinum atque Meletium, quos fidei concinere putabamus, aut inter ipsos pax et concordia salvo ordine ecclesiastico conveniret : aut certe, si quis eorum, altero superstite, decessisset, nulla subrogatio in defuncti locum, superstite altero, gigneretur.'

It is perfectly evident, that if either Paulinus or Meletius had been personally rejected by Rome, such instructions could not have been written by the Italian bishops. They certainly would not have *consented* to the succession of either survivor, without distinction between the two, much less would they

have *recommended* it, if either of these bishops had been actually out of communion with Rome.

But though this testimony might be considered conclusive, we are in possession of still more important evidence.

About two years prior to the second general council, an important synod was assembled at Antioch. Its acts, which were afterwards deposited in the archives of the Roman Church, afford a more formal proof than even the above-mentioned letter, of the fact that the communion of St. Meletius was at that time fully acknowledged by the Roman See; and, as it would appear, his position as Bishop of Antioch, also.

St. Gregory of Nyssa states that he was present at this synod, and that it assembled nine months or a little more after the death of St. Basil the Great; consequently about the month of September, A.D. 379. The second general council at which Meletius presided at Constantinople, and during which he died, took place in the year 381.

In the aforesaid synod of Antioch, A.D. 379, St. Meletius and the bishops assembled under him subscribed to a synodical letter or exposition of faith (of which fragments are still extant), which had been drawn up in a Roman synod held under Pope St. Damasus during the preceding year. This document is distinct both in its date and its subject from another synodical epistle which is sometimes prefixed

Proof
of the
visible communion
of
St. Meletius
with the
Roman See,
Council of Antioch,
A.D. 379.

De
Vita S. Macrinæ.

Subscription
to the
epistle of
the
Roman synod.

to it; but which is actually the copy of one addressed to the bishops of Illyricum, by a former Roman synod held under St. Damasus, A.D. 372, and sent to Illyricum by the hands of Sabinus, a deacon of Milan. Sabinus afterwards proceeded as legate to the East with a copy of the epistle, addressed from Damasus and others assembled in Rome, 'to the Catholic bishops throughout the East.' A reply was immediately returned to Rome, expressing entire assent on the part of St. Meletius and other Eastern bishops. In the collections of councils these two documents are not unfrequently placed together, under a date considerably earlier than that of the later one, which should properly be given as belonging to the Antiochian synod of the year 379, by which it was accepted in the East. At the same time it is by no means impossible that the former epistle also, may have been formally signed in conjunction with the latter, by the bishops of the same synod of Antioch, A.D. 379, in fuller confirmation of the assent which they had previously expressed to it.¹

It will suffice for the present purpose to recite the paragraph appended by the synod of Antioch, A.D.

¹ Both of these synodical letters, that is to say, the first of them, which was brought to the East by Sabinus in the year 372, and immediately assented to by St. Meletius, St. Basil, and others; and the other, which was transmitted to the East from the Roman synod under St. Damasus, A.D. 378, and subscribed by St. Meletius and the bishops assembled under him at Antioch, in the year 379; with full explanation and particulars prefixed to each, may be found amongst the *Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum* of Dom. Coustant, Paris, 1721, coll. 477-500.

379, to the exposition of faith of the Roman synod, held A.D. 378; with the signatures of Meletius and the other bishops, and the notification that they were deposited in the Roman archives. The following is a literal translation:—

‘Here ends this epistle or exposition of the Roman synod held under Damasus the Pope, and transmitted to the East, in which all the Eastern Church, a synod having been convened at Antioch, believing with one accordant faith, and all so consenting to the same faith above set forth, confirm this each with his subscription.’

Then follow the signatures:—

‘I, Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, consent to all things above written, so believing and thinking; and if any one holds opinions contrary to these doctrines, let him be anathema.’

St. Eusebius, Bishop of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicæa, Zeno of Tyre, Eulogius of Edessa, Bematius of Mallo, and Diodorus of Tarsus, subscribe after him to the same effect, and it is added:—

‘In like manner also CXLVI other Eastern bishops subscribed, whose subscription in the original is now preserved in the archives of the Roman Church.’

‘Here ends the Roman and Antiochian synod.’

This proves beyond doubt that the communion of Meletius was then recognised by Rome; and it is to be observed that the signature of Meletius thus formally accepted, bears the title of Bishop of Antioch:—*Episcopus Antiochenus*.

Constant,
Rom. Pont. Epist.
col. 500, n. 5.

Continuation
of
the schism.
Tillemont, Vie
de
S. Flaviend'Antioche.
Theod. Eccl. Hist.
v. 23.
Soerat. Eccl. Hist.
v. 9, 15.
Sozom. Eccl. Hist.
vii. 11, 15, viii. 3.

The schism continued after the death of St. Meletius. In spite of the earnest remonstrance of St. Gregory Nazianzen, the Easterns consecrated Flavian in his place, though Paulinus was still alive. Theodoret says, that they replied to the objections of Paulinus, by reminding him that he had refused the proposals of Meletius. Sozomen says, it was done in spite of the oath to the contrary, and that many in consequence left Flavian, and joined the communion of Paulinus. He adds that the Pope and the Westerns were greatly indignant; that they addressed synodical letters to Paulinus, but would send none to Flavian. Rome withheld her communion from the Bishops who had taken the principal part in his consecration.

Paulinus died about the year 388, having consecrated as his successor the same Evagrius who has been mentioned in the foregoing pages. He did not long survive, and no successor was appointed in his stead. Through the intervention of St. John Chrysostom when elevated to the See of Constantinople, Rome and Egypt became reconciled to Flavian and his adherents, in the seventeenth year of his episcopate. But the Eustathians, though no longer supported by Rome and the West, still kept themselves apart, notwithstanding the earnest efforts of Flavian to win them over, and they continued to do so during the whole time of Porphyry, the successor of St. Flavian, A.D. 404. About the year 413, Porphyry was succeeded in the bishopric of Antioch by Alexander of honoured memory, who had the

happiness of uniting to his communion the greater portion of the Eustathians. After many exhortations and persuasions, he assembled his own clergy and laity, and proceeding to the Church of the Eustathians, took part with them in their psalms. Thus he drew them into unity, and according to Theodoret, from the Western gate to the principal church, the united congregations formed as it were a river of men, to the sorrow of the Jews, Arians, and Pagans, who saw the other streams thus flowing into the ocean of the Church. This was about the year 415, but Tillemont states that a few still kept apart until the year 482, when the relics of St. Eustathius were brought to Antioch, on which occasion the division was completely healed.

The schism healed.

Ecd. Hist. v. 35.

During his episcopate, St. Flavian had placed on the sacred diptychs of the church, the names of both his rival bishops, Paulinus and Evagrius.

Tillemont, who refers to S. Cyr. Alex. ch. 56.

The testimony already produced renders it abundantly evident that Meletius was in acknowledged communion with Rome before the period of the second general council. But even if this testimony were wanting; if it had been unrecorded or lost, as so much else has been lost in the gulf of the fifteen centuries which have elapsed since that period, there still remains the fact that the name of Meletius stands enrolled with honour in Rome's golden book of Saints. He could not have been commemorated in the Roman Martyrology if he had not died in the

Testimony of the Roman Martyrology to the communion of St. Meletius with the Roman See.

Roman communion. No Roman churchman would in such case have proposed the insertion of his name within her sacred canon, and no Roman Pontiff would have permitted it, at any period of the Church's history. Since the so-called Reformation, the Roman Martyrology has more than once undergone careful revision and correction, but the name of Meletius is found there to this day.

Revision
of the
Roman Martyrology
by
Gregory XIII.

When Pope Gregory XIII. had completed his celebrated reformation of the calendar, he applied himself, with the assistance of learned historians, to the correction and republication of the Roman Martyrology, as he himself states in the decree prefixed to it, which is dated January 14, 1584. It is also preceded by a treatise from Cardinal Baronius, 'respecting the Roman Martyrology,' the tenth chapter of which is entitled, 'Concerning the false martyrs of heretics, and their pseudo-martyrologies.' No one will question that to the mind of Cardinal Baronius, communion with the Church necessarily implied communion with the Roman See, and separation from the Roman See involved separation from the Church. It is this, therefore, that he intends when, in the above-mentioned chapter, he appeals to the teaching of the fathers, that no one can be a martyr who is not in unity with the Church, and quotes to that effect the words of St. Cyprian :—'He cannot be a martyr who is not in the Church ; he cannot arrive at the kingdom who abandons her who is about to reign.' This was always the doctrine of the Roman Church ; and

S. Cyp.
Lib. de Unitate
Ecclesie.

if she would not acknowledge as a martyr one who died in torments for his religion outside her visible pale, she certainly would not honour as a confessor any bishop, however zealous, who did not die in her visible communion.

Now this revision of the Martyrology took place shortly after the outbreak of a schism and heresy which prominently denied the necessity of communion with the Roman See. It was conducted, under the eye of the Pope himself, by men who were pre-eminent for their historical learning, and who had free access to the records and stores of information accumulated in the Roman archives. Moreover, the case of Meletius and the schism in Antioch was well known, and could not have been overlooked, particularly in connection with the newly developed heresy. It is therefore inconceivable that the memory of Meletius should have been again put forth at that time, as requiring public veneration and honour from all faithful Catholics, unless it had been made evident and certain, from the ancient tradition of the Roman Church, or from well-established facts of history, that there was no ground whatever for supposing him to have died out of visible and acknowledged communion with the Roman See.

The above-mentioned edition of the Roman Martyrology published by the order of Gregory XIII., was again revised by the authority of his successors, Urban VIII. and Clement X., and ultimately added to and amended by the learned Pope Benedict XIV.

The
Roman Martyrology
again
revised and amended.

The Bull
of
Pope Benedict XIV.

On this occasion, Benedict XIV. issued the Bull,¹ *Postquam intelleximus*, 'on the new edition of the Martyrology,' dated July 1, 1748, and addressed to King John V. of Portugal, at whose instance the work had been undertaken. It gives reasons for several additions and changes then made, and examines into certain cases of difficulty. Amongst these occurs the question respecting the admission of the renowned Clement of Alexandria to a place in the Martyrology. His claim, however, is rejected, on account of some doubt as to his entire freedom from error in doctrine; and the Pope refers to the case of the Emperor Constantine the Great, whose name, he says, was found in the menology of the Greeks, and who was undoubtedly venerated as a saint in the Eastern Church, but whose commemoration was never transferred to the Roman Martyrology, because certain suspicions existed that he had been inclined towards Arianism.

Litteræ Apostolicæ
de
Nov. Martyrol. Ed.
n. 30.

These instances show the scrupulous caution always exercised by the Roman Church as regards every name in her strictly guarded Martyrology. Had there been the slightest ground for suspecting Meletius to have died out of her visible communion, it is perfectly certain that the Roman Church would not have ranked him amongst those to whose intercession

¹ This document, together with the others above mentioned, will be found prefixed to the excellent edition of the Roman Martyrology published, *cum approbatione*, by Mons. Dessain, of Malines, in the year 1859, after the Roman edition of the year 1815.

in the courts of heaven she especially looks up, and whose names she year by year recites in daily course, wherever her world-wide sway extends, as examples to all her children, and as demanding from them the religious veneration and the worship due only to the Saints of God.

St. Meletius is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology, on February 12, as follows:—‘At Antioch the festival of St. Meletius, Bishop, who, having often suffered exile for the Catholic faith, at length, in Constantinople, passed to the Lord: whose virtues were celebrated with highest praise by St. John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nyssa.’

*Antiochiæ sancti Meletii Episcopi, qui pro fide catholica sæpe exilium passus, demum Constanti-
nopoly migravit ad Dominum: cujus virtutes sanctus
Joannes Chrysostomus et Gregorius Nyssenus sum-
mis laudibus celebrârunt.*

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 907 356 0

EX-1200
Robby
v.2

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD



University Research Library

CALL NUMBER

SER

VOL

PT

COP

AUTHOR

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54
FORM L 302 02

